This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

600090770T

1263 f. 82

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

CHURCH DOCTRINE—BIBLE TRUTH.

Fcap. 8vo. **Seventeenth** Thousand. Price 3*s.* 6*d.*

'Some writers have the gift of speaking the right word at the right time, and the Rev. M. F. Sadler is pre-eminently one of them. "Church Doctrine —Bible Truth," is full of wholesome truths fit for these times. . . . He has the power of putting his meaning in a forcible and intelligible way, which will, we trust, enable his valuable work to effect that which it is well calculated to effect, viz. to meet with an appropriate and crushing reply one of the most dangerous misbeliefs of the time.'—*Guardian.*

THE SACRAMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY; or, Testimony of the Scripture to the Teaching of the Church on Holy Baptism. Fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 2*s.* 6*d.* Also, Cheap Edition, **Sixth** Edition, fcap. 8vo. sewed, 6*d.*

'An exceedingly valuable repertory of arguments on the question it refers to.'—*English Churchman.*

LONDON: G. BELL AND SONS.

THE ONE OFFERING.

THE ONE OFFERING:

A Treatise

ON

THE SACRIFICIAL NATURE OF THE EUCHARIST.

BY

THE REV. M. F. SADLER,

RECTOR OF HONITON;

AUTHOR OF 'CHURCH DOCTRINE,—BIBLE TRUTH,' 'THE SECOND ADAM,' ETC.

THIRD EDITION.

LONDON:

GEORGE BELL AND SONS, YORK STREET,

COVENT GARDEN.

1875.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS,
STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SUBJECT.

PAGE

Is the Holy Eucharist an act of worship? 1
Considered to be such by early Christian writers, and in early Liturgies 2
Strong reasons why they should be right in their view . . 4
Eucharist, if an act of worship, must be the most evangelical of all acts of worship 4

CHAPTER II.

THE EUCHARIST AN ACT OF WORSHIP.

Bodies of Christians amongst us who deny this 5
How it is recognized to be this in our service book . . . 6
Note on "oblations" 6
The special Eucharistic act embodied in a prayer . . . 7
Significance of "kneeling" during reception 8

CHAPTER III.

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH AS SET FORTH IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

No particular directions respecting the worship of Christians in Scripture 9
References to stated Christian worship very few 10
Such as there are all refer to Eucharist as the stated worship on the Lord's Day 11
Note on response of Amen, alluded to in 1 Cor. xiv. 16 . . 11

CHAPTER IV.

PROPHETICAL INTIMATION OF THE NATURE OF THE WORSHIP OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

PAGE

Jewish Prophets foretold the worship of the Church of Christ as sacrificial: Jeremiah xxxiii. 15, 22 13
Two prophecies in Malachi 14
Isaiah lvi. 6, 7, and lxvi. 21 15
Note, quoting Bishop Andrews, Archbishop Usher, and Bishop Pearson 16
Prophets recognized the difference between spiritual and formal worship 17
Quotations from Clement and Justin Martyr 18

CHAPTER V.

HOW COULD PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN WORSHIP BE CALLED SACRIFICIAL?

Because Christ ordained it—
In sacrificial terms 21
At a sacrificial time (the Paschal Season) 24
For a sacrificial end or purpose 26
This latter implied in our Lord's use of the word "anamnesis" 26
This anamnesis a remembrance before God 27

CHAPTER VI.

EXAMINATION OF THE WORDS, "WE HAVE AN ALTAR."

This altar cannot be the actual Cross 30
Neither can it be Christ Himself 31
Note on Waterland's opinion 32
Scope and design of the Epistle to the Hebrews 34
What does the Epistle condemn? 35
It cannot condemn the Eucharistic setting forth of Christ's Death 36
The writer of this Epistle must not be credited with Zuinglianism 37

CHAPTER VII.

THE EUCHARIST IN CONNECTION WITH THE MEDIATION OF CHRIST.

The offering of Christ eternal, yet consummated in time . . 39
The Will of Christ in submitting to the Will of His Father that *He should become* a sacrifice 41

PAGE
The ministrations of the Aaronic priests set forth this Will . 42
Did He cease to mediate at His death? 43
The Lamb "standing as slain" 43
The Eucharist the Representation on earth of this heavenly Presentation 45
He presents His people in this Presentation of Himself . . 46
The Highest form of the Mediation of Christ is that He should present Himself as our Head 46
Eucharist sets forth this also 47

CHAPTER VIII.

Christ the Priest in every Eucharist.

Worship of heaven and earth correspond 49
What Christ does in heaven Himself, He does on earth through His ministers 51
His ministers not independent priests; they are but His representatives; He does all 52

CHAPTER IX.

The Priestly Act of Christ a continuous Act.

Epistle to the Hebrews necessitates the Catholic view . . 53
Comparison between the action of the Jewish High Priest and that of Christ in heaven 54
Our Lord's Intercession in heaven is under a distinctly Priestly form 55

CHAPTER X.

The Sense in which the Eucharist is a Sacrifice.

Confusion of terms owing to the several parts of a Sacrifice being taken for one another 57
Four parts in Jewish Sacrifice—
First offering at the door of Tabernacle 57
Mactation 58
Offering of the Blood 59
Consumption 59
This latter took place after Atonement was completed . . 60
That which was on the Altar was consumed as the food of God . 61
Four parts of the Great Atoning Sacrifice . . . 82

The Presentation—
As God, before the worlds . . . . .
As Man, at the Lord's Supper . . . . .
The Mactation on the Cross . . . . . .
This cannot be considered alone apart from the previous P
tation and the Presentation in heaven . . .
The consumption of the Sacrifice of Christ . . .
Contrast between the Jewish Sacrifices and that of Christ
The presentation of the Jewish Sacrifice, because it w
perfect, was momentary; that of Christ, because
perfect, was continuous and eternal . .
In what sense is the Eucharist a Sacrifice? Not because
Christ to be slain again . . . .
Not because we can slay Christ again . . .
In the Eucharist no repetition of the Death of Christ
sacrificial presentation of that Death . .
Before Christ's Death many offerings; after His Death b
This well expressed in words of Chrysostom . .

CHAPTER XI.

The Memorial Sacrifice.

Some say that if the Eucharist is a memorial it is not
fice, but Jewish Sacrifices were memorials .
Eucharist a memorial of the actual Sufferings .
But a Representation of the Sacrifice . . .
Note citing primitive Liturgies 78
The word "memorial" too weak to describe the nature of our
Lord's Presentation of His Death 80
The Mystical Immolation 81
Set forth by St. Chrysostom, Wesley and Ridley . . . 82
Note citing St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, Mede and Jeremy Taylor 83
Testimony to the commemorative nature of the Sacrifice from
Fathers, Mediæval writers, Romanists, the Prayer Book, and
Anglicans 85
Our Lord's Sacrifice not an offering of body and blood physically
separated, but a submission of Will 87
Sacrifice on the Cross and in the Eucharist the same, but in
mystery 89
This mystery arises out of the two natures of our Lord united in
One Person 89

PAGE

The Mystery not a mere figure but a Divine reality; but being unspeakable we call it a mystery 91
Eucharistic Sacrifice is not, and yet is, identical with the Sacrifice on the Cross 92
Note from Roman Catholic writers shewing that Transubstantiation does not renew the actual atoning Sufferings, and so does not account for the mystery 93

CHAPTER XII.

The Memorial Aspect of the Eucharist considered.

Confusion respecting the words "memory," "memorial," and "remembrance" 95
Before whom or to whom is the memorial made? 96
If before God, this must needs be the primary intent of the Eucharistic Act 97
Difficulties in the way of believing that it is primarily a memorial before men 99
If it be only this, our way of celebrating it most inconsistent . 99
Prayer of Consecration actually makes the memorial before God 101
The Puritans, following Calvin by abolishing Consecration, did away effectually with all Sacrifice 102
Memorial aspect of the Eucharist its very essence 103
Answer to the objection that it is needless to remind God of that which He knows 104

CHAPTER XIII.

The Eucharist a Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving.

This conception of the Eucharist acknowledged in the Mass and by Romanists as well as by our own Church 106
The celebration itself constitutes it to be this 107
This brought out in our Liturgy more fully than in any other . 108
It cannot be a sacrifice of praise without being also a sacrifice for other purposes for which we call upon God. . . . 109

CHAPTER XIV.

The Sacrifice of Ourselves.

The design of the Eucharist is to set forth before God, not ourselves, but Christ 111
The Sacrifice of ourselves not an independent offering, but offered in and through the Sacrifice of Christ 113

PAGE

The Institution of Sacrifice implies that man needs an atoning Sacrifice not proceeding from himself 113
Well illustrated by Moehler 114
They who exclude from the Eucharist its Representation of the Death of Christ make it an independent Sacrifice . . 116

CHAPTER XV.

Is the Eucharist a proper Sacrifice?

This question considered by some to decide its ritual . . 118
Difficulty of defining what a Sacrifice really is . . . 118
The three things—the Jewish Sacrifice, the Sacrifice of Christ, and the Eucharist, have no outward features in common . 119
What a Jewish Sacrifice really was 120
No particular prayer ordered in connection with it . . . 121
What the outward form of the Sacrifice of Christ was . . 122
What its inward reality 123
The reconciling act of the Eternal Son the only true and proper Sacrifice 124
The mere infliction of death cannot make the Jewish Sacrifice a proper Sacrifice to the exclusion of the Eucharist . . 125
The outward form of the Eucharist, as compared with any Jewish Sacrifice, always the same 126
Never bore the smallest resemblance to any Jewish offering . 127
Gross misconception of ultra Protestant writers respecting this traceable to Calvin 127
First carried out in our Church in the removal of the table from the east end 128
Attempt to turn the tables into altars 129
Injunctions of Bishop Ridley 129
Futility of this seen from a comparison of the Jewish altar as regards its form, its use, its vessels, and furniture, with those of any Christian altar or table 130
When removed the same thing was done at it as was done before 131
To prove this, the three acts—Jewish, Romish and Anglican—put side by side 132
St. Augustine's definition of Sacrifice 136

CHAPTER XVI.

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE AND SACERDOTALISM.

PAGE

All Sacerdotalism or Priesthood the claim to represent Christ, arising out of the words of Christ Himself . . . 137
All ministers who celebrate the Eucharist must claim to represent Christ 138
In either consecrating or distributing the elements, they put themselves into the place of Christ 139
If anything in Christianity requires a commission, this must . 140
All sects who have any distinct ministry practically acknowledge this 140
Sacrificing priests and non-sacrificing ministers, if in the Church of England, do the same thing 142
The Christian priest the minister of the congregation . . 143
This acknowledged by Romanists 144

CHAPTER XVII.

THE RITUAL OF THE EUCHARIST.

Belief in the Eucharistic Sacrifice influences Ritual . . . 145
1. As regards the position of the Celebrant . . 146–153
2. As regards the use of a distinctive Vestment . 153–162

CHAPTER XVIII.

CONCLUSION 162

APPENDIX A.

TESTIMONY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN FATHERS TO THE DOCTRINE OF A SACRIFICE IN THE EUCHARIST.

Clement, Ignatius, Justin Martyr 169
(Solution of difficulty raised on the ground that early Fathers speak of prayer and praise as the true Sacrifice) . . 170
Irenæus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Cyprian, Cyril, Ambrose, *Jerome, Augustine,* Chrysostom 171

APPENDIX B.

TESTIMONY OF ANCIENT LITURGICAL FORMS. MATTERS IN WHICH THEY ALL AGREE.

PAGE
The Clementine, St. James, St. Mark 175

APPENDIX C.

TESTIMONY OF ALL SCHOOLS OF CATHOLIC WRITERS TO THEIR BELIEF IN THE ALL-SUFFICIENCY OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

Anglo-Catholic writers of the seventeenth century:—
Laud, Cosin, Heylyn, Thorndike, Jeremy Taylor . . 180
Anglo-Catholic writers of this century:—
Pusey, Newman, Keble, Manning, Neale 182
Romanists:—
Council of Trent, Bishop Gardiner, Harding. 'Garden of the Soul,' 'Authorized Catechism,' Moehler . . 183

APPENDIX D.

PROTESTANT WRITERS WHO HAVE ASSERTED THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

Bishop Ridley: observations on his assertion that Christ is offered in the Eucharist "in mystery" 186
Bishop Andrews, Bishop Hall, Mede, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Dr. Brevint (as quoted and approved by John Wesley), and Bishop Beveridge 189

THE SACRIFICIAL NATURE

OF

THE EUCHARIST.

I.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SUBJECT.

It is purposed, with God's help, in the following pages to consider this question:—Is the Holy Eucharist, as it is celebrated according to the Service Book of the Church of England, a Sacrifice?

In order to answer this question, we shall first have to ask and to answer another. Is the Holy Eucharist an act of worship at all?

Now this inquiry is far more serious than vast numbers of religious persons have any idea of; for if the Holy Eucharist be not an act of worship, then the martyrs and confessors, i.e., the foremost Christians in faith and endurance, of the best ages of the Church, offered to Almighty God in their principal devotions on the Lord's day an erroneous, and so, to a great extent (God only knows to what extent), an unacceptable worship. For we have writings of the principal martyrs and confessors of the earliest ages of the Church; we have remains, more than sufficient for our purpose, of Clement the companion of Apostles, of Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus and Cyprian—not to mention such defenders of the faith, in a somewhat later age, as Athanasius, and Augustine, and Chrysostom—and we find, *from their* writings, that all these holy men,

without exception, regarded the Eucharist as the great act of Church worship, and also regarded that worship as sacrificial.*

Besides this, we have Liturgies used in public worship in all parts of the ancient Church, which Liturgies, when all interpolations and mutilations are taken into the fullest account, most certainly represent the mode of worship prevalent in the Church long before the Council of Nicæa. Now these Liturgies, though differing from one another in words, and in the arrangement of their principal parts, have all the same leading features, and all agree in applying sacrificial terms to the Eucharistic action; so that there is a very striking resemblance between the words in which such men as Justin Martyr and Irenæus speak of the Sacrifice in the Eucharist, and the words of the Liturgies in which we have every reason to believe that these holy men commemorated the Passion of Christ.†

Now no real Christian can contemplate the fall of such men from the [supposed] purity of Christian worship without dismay; for if they were so left to their own devices as altogether to change the leading idea of Christian worship, where is our safety? Are we Christ's? so were they; have we the Spirit? so had they; have we the Scriptures? they had them more than we have, for there was no huge accumulation of theological conjectures and traditional interpretations in those days to obscure the true meaning of Scripture.‡

* See Appendix A. † See Appendix B.

‡ The greatest fallacy prevails respecting "tradition" and "traditional interpretations." The opinion of an early father is put down as tradition, whilst the opinion of such writers as Scott or Alford is supposed to be derived from the "pure word." Whereas exactly the contrary is the fact. The eighteenth or nineteenth century writer has

The greater part of these earliest writers could read the language of the New Testament as their vernacular; and they lived so much nearer to the times of the sacred writers that they had incomparably more facility in ascertaining what was the meaning which the Apostles put on their own words than we have. Above all, if bitter persecution and continual danger of death for the sake of Christ have a tendency to wean men from the love of this world, and so to keep their hopes brighter, and their spiritual vision clearer, then they had helps to realise God's word which we in this age of ease and worldly prosperity cannot have: so that it is a very serious thing for us who have, in comparison with them, endured so little for Christ to pronounce them wrong in their whole conception of the nature of Christian worship.

But if the Eucharist be an act of worship, then it is a very serious matter indeed for those who deny that it is such, or for those who through apathy, or want of attention, or thought, neglect to realise it to be such; for if the Eucharist be an act of worship at all, it must be by far the most Christian act of worship which sinners can present to God. For, in the first place, it is the one act ordained by Christ Himself; for all other acts of worship are common to other religions; prayer, praise, thanksgiving can be offered up by the heathen, but the Eucharist belongs solely to Christians.

Then, in the next place, Christ, in ordaining it, used both words and acts, by which He intended to connect it in the closest possible way with His own Sacrifice.

---

eighteen or nineteen centuries of human interpretation to obscure the meaning, whereas Justin Martyr or Irenæus had but one. The Protestant writer of our days can no more divest himself of the influence of his traditions than the Popish writer can free himself from his.

PAGE

The Presentation—
As God, before the worlds 62
As Man, at the Lord's Supper 63
The Mactation on the Cross 64
This cannot be considered alone apart from the previous Presentation and the Presentation in heaven . . . 64–66
The consumption of the Sacrifice of Christ 67
Contrast between the Jewish Sacrifices and that of Christ. . 68
The presentation of the Jewish Sacrifice, because it was imperfect, was momentary; that of Christ, because it was perfect, was continuous and eternal 68
In what sense is the Eucharist a Sacrifice? Not because we offer Christ to be slain again 70
Not because we can slay Christ again 71
In the Eucharist no repetition of the Death of Christ, but a sacrificial presentation of that Death 72
Before Christ's Death many offerings; after His Death but One . 73
This well expressed in words of Chrysostom 74

CHAPTER XI.

The Memorial Sacrifice.

Some say that if the Eucharist is a memorial it is not a Sacrifice, but Jewish Sacrifices were memorials 75
Eucharist a memorial of the actual Sufferings 77
But a Representation of the Sacrifice 78
Note citing primitive Liturgies 78
The word "memorial" too weak to describe the nature of our Lord's Presentation of His Death 80
The Mystical Immolation 81
Set forth by St. Chrysostom, Wesley and Ridley 82
Note citing St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, Mede and Jeremy Taylor 83
Testimony to the commemorative nature of the Sacrifice from Fathers, Mediæval writers, Romanists, the Prayer Book, and Anglicans 85
Our Lord's Sacrifice not an offering of body and blood physically separated, but a submission of Will 87
Sacrifice on the Cross and in the Eucharist the same, but in mystery 89
This mystery arises out of the two natures of our Lord united in *One Person* 89

PAGE

ıry not a mere figure but a Divine reality; but being akable we call it a mystery 91

› Sacrifice is not, and yet *is*, identical with the Sacrifice Cross 92

Roman Catholic writers shewing that Transubstantia- ›es not renew the actual atoning Sufferings, and so t account for the mystery 93

CHAPTER XII.

ſEMORIAL ASPECT OF THE EUCHARIST CONSIDERED.

specting the words "memory," "memorial," and ıbrance" 95

ı or to whom is the memorial made? . . . 96

›d, this must needs be the primary intent of the tic Act 97

the way of believing that it is primarily a memorial n 99

is, our way of celebrating it most inconsistent . 99

ecration actually makes the memorial before God 101

, following Calvin by abolishing Consecration, did ectually with all Sacrifice 102

ect of the Eucharist its very essence 103

ıe objection that it is needless to remind God of ›ch He knows 104

CHAPTER XIII.

THE EUCHARIST A SACRIFICE OF PRAISE AND THANKSGIVING.

This conception of the Eucharist acknowledged in the Mass and by Romanists as well as by our own Church . . . 106

The celebration itself constitutes it to be this 107

This brought out in our Liturgy more fully than in any other . 108

It cannot be a sacrifice of praise without being also a sacrifice for other purposes for which we call upon God. . . . 109

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SACRIFICE OF OURSELVES.

The design of the Eucharist is to set forth before God, not ourselves, but Christ 111

The Sacrifice of ourselves not an independent offering, but offered *in and through* the Sacrifice of Christ 11

PAGE

The Institution of Sacrifice implies that man needs an atoning Sacrifice not proceeding from himself 113
Well illustrated by Moehler 114
They who exclude from the Eucharist its Representation of the Death of Christ make it an independent Sacrifice . . 116

CHAPTER XV.

Is the Eucharist a proper Sacrifice?

This question considered by some to decide its ritual . . 118
Difficulty of defining what a Sacrifice really is . . . 118
The three things—the Jewish Sacrifice, the Sacrifice of Christ, and the Eucharist, have no outward features in common . 119
What a Jewish Sacrifice really was 120
No particular prayer ordered in connection with it . . . 121
What the outward form of the Sacrifice of Christ was . . 122
What its inward reality 123
The reconciling act of the Eternal Son the only true and proper Sacrifice 124
The mere infliction of death cannot make the Jewish Sacrifice a proper Sacrifice to the exclusion of the Eucharist . . 125
The outward form of the Eucharist, as compared with any Jewish Sacrifice, always the same 126
Never bore the smallest resemblance to any Jewish offering . 127
Gross misconception of ultra Protestant writers respecting this traceable to Calvin 127
First carried out in our Church in the removal of the table from the east end 128
Attempt to turn the tables into altars 129
Injunctions of Bishop Ridley 129
Futility of this seen from a comparison of the Jewish altar as regards its form, its use, its vessels, and furniture, with those of any Christian altar or table 130
When removed the same thing was done at it as was done before 131
To prove this, the three acts—Jewish, Romish and Anglican—put side by side 132
St. Augustine's definition of Sacrifice 136

CHAPTER XVI.

The Eucharistic Sacrifice and Sacerdotalism.

PAGE

All Sacerdotalism or Priesthood the claim to represent Christ, arising out of the words of Christ Himself . . . 137
All ministers who celebrate the Eucharist must claim to represent Christ 138
In either consecrating or distributing the elements, they put themselves into the place of Christ 139
If anything in Christianity requires a commission, this must . 140
All sects who have any distinct ministry practically acknowledge this 140
Sacrificing priests and non-sacrificing ministers, if in the Church of England, do the same thing 142
The Christian priest the minister of the congregation . . 143
This acknowledged by Romanists 144

CHAPTER XVII.

The Ritual of the Eucharist.

Belief in the Eucharistic Sacrifice influences Ritual . . . 145
1. As regards the position of the Celebrant . . 146–153
2. As regards the use of a distinctive Vestment . 153–162

CHAPTER XVIII.

Conclusion 162

APPENDIX A.

Testimony of Early Christian Fathers to the Doctrine of a Sacrifice in the Eucharist.

Clement, Ignatius, Justin Martyr 169
(Solution of difficulty raised on the ground that early Fathers speak of prayer and praise as the true Sacrifice) . . 170
Irenæus, Tertullian, *Hippolytus*, Origen, Cyprian, Cyril, Ambrose, *Jerome, Augustine*, Chrysostom 171

APPENDIX B.

TESTIMONY OF ANCIENT LITURGICAL FORMS. MATTERS IN WHICH THEY ALL AGREE.

PAGE

The Clementine, St. James, St. Mark 175

APPENDIX C.

TESTIMONY OF ALL SCHOOLS OF CATHOLIC WRITERS TO THEIR BELIEF IN THE ALL-SUFFICIENCY OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

Anglo-Catholic writers of the seventeenth century:—
Laud, Cosin, Heylyn, Thorndike, Jeremy Taylor . . 180
Anglo-Catholic writers of this century:—
Pusey, Newman, Keble, Manning, Neale 182
Romanists:—
Council of Trent, Bishop Gardiner, Harding. 'Garden of the Soul,' 'Authorized Catechism,' Moehler . . 183

APPENDIX D.

PROTESTANT WRITERS WHO HAVE ASSERTED THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

Bishop Ridley: observations on his assertion that Christ is offered in the Eucharist "in mystery" 186
Bishop Andrews, Bishop Hall, Mede, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Dr. Brevint (as quoted and approved by John Wesley), and Bishop Beveridge 189

THE SACRIFICIAL NATURE

OF

THE EUCHARIST.

I.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SUBJECT.

It is purposed, with God's help, in the following pages to consider this question:—Is the Holy Eucharist, as it is celebrated according to the Service Book of the Church of England, a Sacrifice?

In order to answer this question, we shall first have to ask and to answer another. Is the Holy Eucharist an act of worship at all?

Now this inquiry is far more serious than vast numbers of religious persons have any idea of; for if the Holy Eucharist be not an act of worship, then the martyrs and confessors, i.e., the foremost Christians in faith and endurance, of the best ages of the Church, offered to Almighty God in their principal devotions on the Lord's day an erroneous, and so, to a great extent (God only knows to what extent), an unacceptable worship. For we have writings of the principal martyrs and confessors of the earliest ages of the Church; we have remains, more than sufficient for our purpose, of Clement the companion of Apostles, of Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus and Cyprian—not to mention such defenders of the faith, in a somewhat later age, as Athanasius, and Augustine, and Chrysostom—and we find, *from* their writings, that all these holy men,

without exception, regarded the Eucharist as the great act of Church worship, and also regarded that worship as sacrificial.*

Besides this, we have Liturgies used in public worship in all parts of the ancient Church, which Liturgies, when all interpolations and mutilations are taken into the fullest account, most certainly represent the mode of worship prevalent in the Church long before the Council of Nicæa. Now these Liturgies, though differing from one another in words, and in the arrangement of their principal parts, have all the same leading features, and all agree in applying sacrificial terms to the Eucharistic action; so that there is a very striking resemblance between the words in which such men as Justin Martyr and Irenæus speak of the Sacrifice in the Eucharist, and the words of the Liturgies in which we have every reason to believe that these holy men commemorated the Passion of Christ.†

Now no real Christian can contemplate the fall of such men from the [supposed] purity of Christian worship without dismay; for if they were so left to their own devices as altogether to change the leading idea of Christian worship, where is our safety? Are we Christ's? so were they; have we the Spirit? so had they; have we the Scriptures? they had them more than we have, for there was no huge accumulation of theological conjectures and traditional interpretations in those days to obscure the true meaning of Scripture.‡

* See Appendix A. † See Appendix B.

‡ The greatest fallacy prevails respecting "tradition" and "traditional interpretations." The opinion of an early father is put down as tradition, whilst the opinion of such writers as Scott or Alford is *supposed to be derived* from the "pure word." Whereas exactly the *contrary is the fact. The eighteenth* or nineteenth century writer has

The greater part of these earliest writers could read the language of the New Testament as their vernacular; and they lived so much nearer to the times of the sacred writers that they had incomparably more facility in ascertaining what was the meaning which the Apostles put on their own words than we have. Above all, if bitter persecution and continual danger of death for the sake of Christ have a tendency to wean men from the love of this world, and so to keep their hopes brighter, and their spiritual vision clearer, then they had helps to realise God's word which we in this age of ease and worldly prosperity cannot have: so that it is a very serious thing for us who have, in comparison with them, endured so little for Christ to pronounce them wrong in their whole conception of the nature of Christian worship.

But if the Eucharist be an act of worship, then it is a very serious matter indeed for those who deny that it is such, or for those who through apathy, or want of attention, or thought, neglect to realise it to be such; for if the Eucharist be an act of worship at all, it must be by far the most Christian act of worship which sinners can present to God. For, in the first place, it is the one act ordained by Christ Himself; for all other acts of worship are common to other religions; prayer, praise, thanksgiving can be offered up by the heathen, but the Eucharist belongs solely to Christians.

Then, in the next place, Christ, in ordaining it, used both words and acts, by which He intended to connect it in the closest possible way with His own Sacrifice.

---

eighteen or nineteen centuries of human interpretation to obscure the meaning, whereas Justin Martyr or Irenæus had but one. The Protestant writer of our days can no more divest himself of the influence of *his traditions than the Popish* writer can free himself from his.

He brake bread in token that His own Body should be broken upon the cross for our sins; He poured the wine into the cup in token that His Blood should be shed for the remission of sins; He identified this bread and this cup with His own Body and Blood when He said, "This is my Body;" "This is my Blood." And He commanded all to be done by His disciples as a remembrance, or memorial, or commemoration of Himself, using the same words to express "do this," and "remembrance," as are used in Scripture in connection with the most solemn sacrifices.

It is quite clear from this, that if Christ intended that this service which He instituted should be a public service of religious worship, then no other act of worship can come near to it; for it is the one service which we have for the setting forth, in His own ordained way, of the Sacrifice of the Son of God in visible connection with our prayers, praises, thanksgivings, alms, and offering of ourselves. If, then, the Eucharist be an act of worship, it is by far the most evangelical of all acts of worship—if by "evangelical" we mean closely connected with, and resting upon, the one all-sufficient Sacrifice.

For in all other sacrifices or offerings we offer what seems to be our own—the product of our own minds, or wills, or a portion of our own property: something which proceeds from ourselves, and which derives its value from the state of ourselves, our minds, and hearts; whereas in the Eucharist we set before God, and afterwards ourselves partake of, That which is no part of ourselves, and which in no sense derives its dignity and virtue from us; which has no appreciable value in itself, but which derives all its value from its God-ordained connection with the Sacrifice of the Lamb *of God.*

II.

THE EUCHARIST AN ACT OF WORSHIP.

We have now to consider the question, How is the Eucharist an act of worship? In what way do we celebrate it so that it should be this, and not an act of mere instruction, or a help to remind ourselves of that which we might otherwise forget?

There are bodies of Christians amongst us who formally deny that it is an act of worship, and they administer it in such a way as to present as little as possible the appearance of the thing which they repudiate. It is true that their celebration of the Lord's Supper is more or less accompanied with hymns, and prayers, and thanksgivings, but the actual Eucharist or Communion is carefully divested of everything which can make it appear more than a memorial feast. For instance, there is no presenting of oblations or gifts upon the altar, for there is not only no altar, but no table forming any part of the recognised furniture of the Church. There is no Consecration, for the efficacy of such a thing is denied utterly, and one of the Scripture accounts of the institution is read for the instruction or edification of those present. The elements are distributed and consumed on tables brought into the building for the occasion; and the bread and wine are received in a sitting posture, which is certainly not a posture *of worship*.

I do not draw attention to this for any invidious purpose, but simply to bring out the contrast which our service presents, and by that contrast to show in what Eucharistic worship really consists; for we must carefully distinguish between that which actually constitutes the Eucharist itself, and without which it would not be the Holy Thing which Christ ordained, and the service of prayer and praise in which the devotion of the Church has enshrined it. There are in our office of Holy Communion, as there are in all others, prayers, supplications, intercessions, and giving of thanks, all which may be separated from the office, without affecting the validity of the Sacrament. For instance, the angelic hymn, "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory," forms a part of the "Te Deum." The "Gloria in Excelsis," also, is not to be found in the Eastern Liturgies; but that which especially distinguishes the service as that which Christ ordained is the setting of the elements on the table with prayer, i.e., the offering of them to God, the Consecration, including the breaking of the bread, and the taking of the cup as Christ took it, and the consumption by priest and people of That Which has been consecrated. Now all these things are done in our service, not as if they are performed for the mere edification of the people, but as if they are parts of the worship of Almighty God. The bread and wine are first placed on the table or altar, and then, along with the other devotions of the faithful, are presented to Almighty God in the words, "We humbly beseech Thee to accept our alms and oblations which we offer to Thy Divine Majesty." * Then the Consecra-

* *That by the* oblations are meant the bread and wine which, *according to the most* ancient custom of the Universal Church, were

tion, instead of being the mere reading of a passage of Scripture for edification, is embodied in a prayer which

---

first offered to God before they could be consecrated, is clear from the following facts. In the First Prayer-book of Edward the Sixth there was a distinct rubric directing the minister, before the prayer for the Church Militant, to place on the holy table as much bread and wine as was needed; this was after the collecting of the alms. In the Second Book (which in this respect remained unaltered till the last revision) this rubric was entirely omitted, and no mention made of the placing the bread and wine on the table, but a rubric was inserted immediately before the prayer for the Church Militant to this effect: "Then shall the churchwardens, or some other by them appointed, gather the devotion of the people, and put the same into the poor man's box." At this revision (1552) the words "to accept our alms" were inserted in the margin in italics and in brackets in the same way as at present; no mention being made of "oblations." At the last revision, that of 1661, the present rubric, running, "When there is a Communion the priest shall then place upon the table as much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient," was inserted just after the rubric for the collection and presentation of the alms; and the word "oblation" was added for the first time in the margin (to accept our alms *and* oblations). That these "oblations" are not another sort of alms is evident from the marginal rubric: "If there be no alms *or* oblations then shall the words," &c. This implies that the alms may be collected at times when there is no Communion, and that this prayer may be read at times when there is neither a collection for the poor, or a celebration. That the word "oblations" points to the bread and wine is abundantly certain from the fact that "oblations" is the translation of the ancient words *προσφορά*, and Latin *oblatio*, which were from the first applied to the bread and wine. It is also certain that the last revisors did earnestly desire to bring back the Church of England to more primitive and Catholic usages, and so they brought back the primitive rite that the elements should be placed on the altar by the priest, and gave them their ancient name. If it be yet objected that by the word oblations may be meant other offerings besides what are usually called alms, I answer that these are separately recognised in the rubric where it is said "the churchwardens . . . . shall receive the alms for the poor, *and other devotions of the people*, in a decent basin," &c. Such "devotions" would, of course, be collected with the alms, and might be collected when there was no celebration, *just as they are now at times.*

is offered to Almighty God, commemorating before God, and solemnly reminding Him, of His own ordained work of Redemption. In the course of this prayer the priest, at the moment when he recites to God the Father the words and acts of God the Son, accompanies this recitation to God with the same manual acts of breaking the bread and taking the cup which Christ Himself performed. Now doing this in the course of the prayer, he does it to, or before God, for he does it in a prayer which he is addressing to God, not in a sermon or address which he is delivering to his fellow-creatures.

After the partaking on the part of the priest, there comes the distribution to the communicants of That Which has been consecrated, which is received by each one in a kneeling posture. Now let the reader remember that it is a matter of indifference, so far as our present investigation is concerned, whether this kneeling be before God the Father, to whom all the rest of the service is offered, or before the Sacramental Presence of God the Son. To whichever of the Persons in the Trinity it is done, it is still the lowly posture of prayer, showing that we hold the whole of that which Christ instituted, from first to last, to form one great act of Christian worship.

III.

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH AS SET FORTH IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

We have now to consider whether this conception of the Eucharist as being an act of worship as well as a communion is in accordance with the Scriptures.

Now here we have to face the fact that no account of the way in which the Apostolic Christians conducted the public worship of God on the Lord's day is to be found in the Scriptures. No directions are given that public worship should be left so entirely to the presiding minister or elder, that his prayers, composed either previously or on the spur of the moment, and interspersed with hymns and readings, should be the sole offering of prayer to Almighty God. It is extremely improbable that Christian congregations should have been left entirely in the hands of one man in the matter of their communion with God as His Church, and we find that there are no directions for any such a mode of worship.

Neither are there any orders given that public worship should begin with the reading of a text from Scripture, and should proceed to a general confession, to Absolution, to the Lord's Prayer, and then Psalms, Lessons, and Hymns. If then no rule of worship was laid down for Christians in the New Testament, was there any *stated public worship*? and what was its nature?

The very first notice of the institution of the Christian Church on the Day of Pentecost teaches us that the Apostolic Christians "continued steadfastly in the breaking of bread and in the prayers" (*ταῖς προσευχαῖς*). This breaking of bread was, of course, the celebration of the Holy Communion, or Eucharist, but the prayers must mean the prayers at certain hours in the Temple; for we read in the next chapter that the Apostles went up at the stated hours to pray in the Temple; and throughout the Book of the Acts we have intimations that the Christians in Jerusalem attended the public services of the Temple, or used it for private prayer. We find, also, that in every city where there were Jews the Apostles and other Christians attended their synagogues, and preached and disputed there. But in order to ascertain what was the strictly Christian worship of the Church, these accounts of Christians taking part in Jewish worship must be left out of consideration, and we must confine ourselves to the notices of what took place at the Christian assemblies at stated times, such as on the Lord's day.

Now we find that such references to stated Christian worship are exceedingly few—in fact, not more than five or six in all.*

* (1) Acts xx. 7. "Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them."

(2) 1 Cor. xi. 20. "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper, for in eating," &c., to end.

(3) 1 Cor. xiv. 16. A reference to the Eucharist is probable in this verse, but the remainder of the passage refers to the exercise of spiritual gifts in preaching or exhortation.

(4) Heb. x. 25. "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is."

(5) James ii. 2. "If there come into your assembly a man with a *gold ring*," &c.

Of these, two simply imply the fact that Christians met together (presumably for worship), but say not one word respecting the nature of that worship, and furnish us with no particular respecting it. These are, first, Hebrews x. 25, in which Christians are commanded not to "forsake the assembling of themselves together;" and, secondly, James ii. 2, in which they are commanded not to allow distinctions between rich and poor in their assemblies. From a third place, 1 Cor. xiv. 16, we learn that it was the custom for the whole assembly to respond aloud with the word "Amen," when the minister or celebrant came to the end of the special Eucharistic prayer;* but this is all that is told us, and the context has to do with regulating the exercise of the gifts of tongues and interpretations of tongues in the matter of prophecy or preaching.

* This response of "Amen" is especially alluded to by Justin Martyr as forming a remarkable feature in the Eucharistic worship of Christians. His words are, "There is then brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he, taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the Universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these things at his Hands; and when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgiving all the people express their assent by saying 'Amen.' This word Amen answers in the Hebrew language to γένοιτο (so be it)." St. Chrysostom also, in commenting on this place (1 Cor. xiv. 16), supposes a reference to the same part of the Eucharistic service. His words are, "And what he (the Apostle) saith is this, 'If thou shalt bless in a barbarian tongue, not knowing what thou sayest, nor able to interpret, the layman cannot respond the Amen. For not hearing the words "for ever and ever," which are at the end, he doth not say the Amen.'" In confirmation of this we may mention that in both the Liturgies of St. Clement and St. James these very words "for ever and ever" come at the conclusion of the great Eucharistic prayer, and are followed by a special rubric or direction, "And let all the people say Amen." 43

In the two remaining places, Acts xx. 7, and 1 Cor. xi. 20, the only service for which Christians are supposed specially to come together is "The breaking of bread," or the Eucharist.

So that, startling as it may seem to some, it is nevertheless true that the only stated act of worship for which Christians met in New Testament times was the celebration of the Eucharist. Judged by the evidence afforded by the Apostolic writers, the only strictly Christian service is the Eucharist.

Let it be understood, however, that I do not for one moment assert that Christians met for no other purposes than to celebrate the Eucharist. They met for prayer at all times, and in all places; at a private house, on the seashore, in the Temple. Everywhere they seemed to have had perfect liberty to "lift up holy hands."

But what I do assert is, that there is no reference to any stated assembly on the Lord's day of the Christian Church, gathered together as Christ's body, except to meetings for the celebration of the Holy Communion; and with this the very earliest account of Christian worship agrees, for when Justin Martyr, writing within one hundred years after the publication of the first book of the New Testament, and within fifty years after the publication of its last book, has occasion to describe the religious rites of the Christian Church, he describes the service of the Church on the Lord's day as consisting mainly of the Eucharist, connecting all other prayers and thanksgivings and readings and exhortations with the celebration of Holy Communion.

IV.

PROPHETICAL INTIMATION OF THE NATURE OF THE WORSHIP OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

SCANTY then though the references to Christian worship in the New Testament are, yet all those which teach us anything respecting it, teach us its sacramental nature.

But "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," and long before the New Testament was written, holy men, who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," described in prophecy the worship of the times of the Messiah. Their testimony respecting it seems to me to have received nothing like the attention which it demands, for the influence of the prophets in moulding the terminology of the ancient Church respecting its worship is very distinctly traceable in the earliest Christian writings. There are a considerable number of prophecies in which the prophet, speaking in God's name, describes in vision the worship of the kingdom of Christ, and in every case he describes it under sacrificial images.

The most circumstantial of these places is Jeremiah xxxiii. 15–18; and in the latter part of the same chapter (verses 19–22) there is another distinct prophecy on the same subject, delivered apparently at another time,* for it begins with the words, "And the word of the Lord came unto Jeremiah, saying," &c.

* The whole prophecy runs thus: "In those days, and at that time, will I *cause the Branch* of Righteousness to grow up unto David; and

In each of these visions the Messiah, the Branch of Righteousness, is seen in vision as reigning on the throne of His father David (Luke i. 32), and with Him and under Him the prophet saw "priests, Levites," ministering by "offering burnt-offerings, and kindling meat-offerings, and doing sacrifice continually."

In the second prophecy, the same covenant, which stands fast with the spiritual David, stands fast also with the ministers of the sacrificial system—the priests, the Levites, God's ministers.

So that the tenor of these prophecies demand that in the spiritual kingdom of the Messiah, i.e., in the Church of Christ, there should be ministers under Him, who may in some true and proper sense be called priests, and who offer up worship which may, in some equally true and proper sense, be called sacrifice.

Two prophecies in Malachi set forth the same truth. The first describes certain sacrificial offerings of the Old Testament as prevailing in the times of the Messiah, and offered up to God, not by Jews, but by those who were not enabled till the time of Christ to worship

---

he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our righteousness. For thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the House of Israel; neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually. And the word of the Lord came unto Jeremiah, saying, Thus saith the Lord; If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers. As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the *sand of the sea measured: so* will I multiply the seed of David my *servant, and the Levites that* minister unto me."

God as His covenant people. "From the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, My Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto My Name, and a pure offering [or *mincha*, i.e., offering of fine flour or bread], for My Name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts" (Mal. i. 11).

The second tells us that one of the principal objects of the coming of the Messiah is to raise up a better ministry than the Levitical, and yet having in some sort the same sacrificial functions. "He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old and the years that are past" (Mal. iii. 3).

Here the ministers of the Messiah are spoken of as the "sons of Levi," their ministration is an offering to the Lord; and this in order that the offering of Judah and Jerusalem, i.e., of the whole Christian body, may be pleasant unto the Lord. The special part taken by the Christian ministers prophesied of as "Sons of Levi" being clearly distinguished from that taken by the whole body of believers.

Again, in Isaiah lvi. 6, 7, we read: "The sons of the stranger that join themselves to the Lord. . . . Even them will I bring to My holy mountain, and make them joyful in My house of prayer; their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon Mine altar, for Mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all nations." This place also must refer to the times of the Christian Church, and yet burnt-offerings and sacrifices are *spoken of as* offered conjointly with prayers.

Again, in Isaiah lxvi. 21, the restored remnant of Israel are taken by God "for priests and for Levites," which must betoken, if such sacred words have a fitting meaning, that they are taken to be the ministers of a system in some sense sacrificial.*

Now I earnestly desire not unduly to press the significance of these prophecies. I would attempt to make the least of them rather than the most; so far, that is, as they bear on the matter under consideration; but it is impossible to deny that in each one of them the worship of the glorious Messianic future is assumed

* Three such writers as Bishop Andrews, Archbishop Usher, and Bishop Pearson, all understand this place as prophetical of the appointment of a Christian ministry.

Bishop Andrews:—"That God Himself saith of the Christian Church under the Gentiles, that He will take of the Gentiles and make them Priests and Levites to Himself (Essay lxvi. 21) there calling our Presbyters and Deacons by those legal names." (Cited by Mr. Carter from 'A Summary View of the Government both of the Old and New Testaments,' one of Bishop Andrews' minor works in Anglo. Cath. Library, p. 350.)

Archbishop Usher:—"The government of the Church of the Old Testament was committed to the Priests and Levites, unto whom the ministers of the New do now succeed, in like sort as our Lord's Day hath done unto their Sabbath, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet, touching the vocation of the Gentiles: 'I will take of them for Priests and for Levites, saith the Lord.'" (Isaiah lxvi. 21.) ('The Original of Bishops,' &c. vol. vii. p. 43. Van Mildert's Edition.)

Bishop Pearson:—"There were various orders under the law in the ancient temple; and there are likewise various orders under the Gospel. Prophecy uttered indeed during the time of the law, but to be fulfilled in the times of the Gospel, altogether confirms this. For thus it was written in Isaiah (lxvi. 21): 'I will take of them for Priests and for Levites, saith the Lord.' And thus it was fulfilled by Christ, for He called to Himself (1) Apostles, (2) The seventy disciples." ('Minor Theological Works,' vol. i. p. 274.)

I am indebted for these quotations to the Appendix to 'Rev. T. T. *Carter on the Priesthood.*'

to be in some sense sacrificial, and to be celebrated by men bearing the official names of the ministers of the existing sacrificial system.

We cannot but gather from this that that resolute opposition to sacerdotal names and functions, as existing in Christianity, which so many both in and out of the Church affect, is contrary to the mind of the Spirit Who inspired the thoughts, and in some cases, we know, dictated the very language of these prophets.

Again, unless there be something in the worship of the Church answering in its public sacerdotal character to burnt-offerings and sacrifices, these prophecies have not been fulfilled. If, besides its verbal offerings of psalms or hymns, or of alms, or of hearts and lives, there be nothing in the worship of the Christian Church which can be properly called sacrificial, then it appears to me that the prophets could not have been under the inspiration of Him Who knows the end from the beginning.

For it cannot be urged for a moment that the prophets could only express themselves in the current language of their day, which (it is wrongly supposed) knew no other mode of worship than sacrifice. So far from this, one of the principal purposes for which the prophets seem to have been raised up was to show the distinction between the mere ritual worship of the public services, and the sacrifices of the heart and life. God, for instance, asks by the mouth of Isaiah: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of rams, or of he goats." And then he proceeds to set forth the more acceptable sacrifices of ourselves. "Cease to do evil, learn to do well, seek

judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow."

Again, in the fiftieth Psalm: "Thinkest thou that I will eat bull's flesh, and drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God thanksgiving, and pay thy vows unto the Most Highest." And in the fifty-first: "Thou desirest no sacrifice, else would I give it Thee, but Thou delightest not in burnt-offerings. The sacrifice of God is a troubled spirit, a broken and a contrite heart, O God, shalt Thou not despise." The distinction between mere outside ritual observance and the devout worship of the heart is as clearly set forth in the Old Testament as it is in the New, so that nothing would have been easier than for the prophets to have prophesied that in the reign of Christ there should be a totally different worship, so different that it could not be esteemed properly sacrificial.

Verbal offerings of prayer and praise were common to the Jewish and Christian systems. The Jew had the Psalms, the singing of which formed a part of the Temple worship as well as the burnt-sacrifices, and the use of which has from the very first prevailed in the Christian Church. On the anti-sacrificial view of Christian worship there should have been clear intimations that under Christ there would be a full and complete cessation of all that had been hitherto esteemed sacerdotal and sacrificial; but instead of this, the prophets seem to project the whole sacrificial system of their times into the Messianic period.

The effect of this may be judged from the fact that St. Clement, a contemporary of the apostles, describes the celebration of Christian worship in the words "presenting the offerings" (Clement, First Epistle to *Corinthians, ch.* xliv.). And the earliest Christian

writer who gives at any length an account of the worship of that early period (A.D. 130 or 140), viz., Justin Martyr, cites the prophecies of the Old Testament in proof of the sacrificial character of Christian Eucharistical offerings. In his 'Dialogue with Trypho' he had been showing, much in the same way as any modern expositor of types would show, that Jewish sacrifices, such, particularly, as the Passover, and the two goats of the Day of Atonement, were typical of Christ; and then he proceeds to consider the mincha, or offering of fine flour (unfortunately rendered by our translators "the meat-offering"), and on this he remarks: "And the offering of fine flour, sirs, I said, which was prescribed to be presented on behalf of those purified from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, the celebration of which our Lord Jesus Christ prescribed, in remembrance of the suffering which He endured on behalf of those who are purified in soul from all iniquity, in order that we may at the same time thank God for having created the world, with all things therein, for the sake of man, and for delivering us from the evil in which we were, and for utterly overthrowing principalities and powers by Him who suffered according to His will. Hence God speaks by the mouth of Malachi, one of the twelve [lesser prophets], as I said before about the sacrifices at that time presented by you: 'I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord; and I will not accept your sacrifices at your hands; for from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, My Name has been glorified among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to My Name and a pure offering; for My Name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord, but ye profane it.' He speaks of those Gentiles, namely us, who in every place

offer sacrifices to him, i.e., the bread of the Eucharist, and also the cup of the Eucharist, affirming both that we glorify His name, and that you profane it."*

The conclusion we draw from all this is, of course, that the terms applied to Christian worship by the inspired prophets and by the earliest Christian writers are identical.

* I give a second passage from this Father in Appendix A.

V.

HOW COULD PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN WORSHIP BE CALLED SACRIFICIAL?

For what reason then could the earliest Christian worship be called sacrificial? for sacrificial it must be, in some sense in which the Jewish burnt-offerings were sacrificial —in some sense over and above that in which an ordinary service of psalms, hymns, or prayers could be accounted sacrificial. These prophecies cannot possibly be fulfilled by a service of mere prayer and psalmody; they must point to the celebration of some public ecclesiastical rite resembling the old sacrifice in its power of setting forth and pleading the One all-sufficient Sacrifice.

Now, the notices of Christian worship which we find in the New Testament, scanty though they be, clearly indicate that the rite among Christians which corresponds with the prophecies of Jeremiah and Malachi is the celebration of the Eucharist.

But the outward form of the celebration of the Eucharist never has had, and never can have, the smallest resemblance to the mode of offering or immolating a Jewish sacrifice; not even to the Jewish mincha, the form of offering under which Malachi foreshadows Christian worship. For, to say nothing of other differences, in all these offerings the victim, or thing offered, was wholly or partially consumed by fire; whereas, *in the Eucharist*, all that is offered to God is

received, as it were, from Him again, and devoutly consumed by the worshippers.* What reason, then, have we for accounting the Eucharist, or celebration of Holy Communion, as a sacrifice?

I answer, we account it a sacrifice, because of the words in which our Great High Priest ordained it; because of the time in which He ordained it; and because of the end for which He ordained it.

He ordained it in sacrificial terms, at a sacrificial time, and for a sacrificial end.

1. He ordained it in sacrificial terms. "Take, eat, this is My body, which is being given for you." "Drink ye all of it, for this is My blood of the New Covenant" (or the New Covenant in My blood) "which is shed" (or is being shed) "for you." Now, His body was given as a sacrifice, and His Blood was shed in sacrifice in fulfilment of all bloody sacrifices which had been hitherto offered by the people of God.

Let the reader also observe that in giving our Lord's words I have ventured to render them exactly according to the tense, for our Lord does not say, "*shall* be given," "*shall* be shed," or (as in 1 Cor. xi. 24) "*shall* be broken;" nor strictly "*is* given," "*is* shed," "*is* broken," but "is *being* given," "is *being* shed," "is *being*

* In all offerings of the Jews, with two remarkable exceptions—(1.) The Passover, which is called a sacrifice (Deut. xvi. 2, 5, 6), all of which was consumed by the worshippers, or intended to be, and if any was left, and so had to be consumed by fire, the circumstance was accidental. (2.) The Shew-bread, called an offering (Levit. xxiv. 7), was offered by being solemnly set forth before God on a table before the veil, and after it had remained on the table from Sabbath to Sabbath, was taken by the priests.

Both these, I need hardly say, were especial types of the Eucharist, *were called* sacrifices, and yet were wholly eaten by men, not destroyed *by fire.*

broken." It was there and then given in sacrifice in the sense of being there and then surrendered at the time when He blessed and brake; and His Blood was then "*being* shed," for it was then surrendered to be shed. This was the solemn time at which He offered Himself. Every sacrifice must be offered or presented; first, in intention, when the offerer determined to bring it to the altar; then, in formal surrender, when, having brought it to the altar, he delivered it up to the priest to be slain, or to be otherwise dealt with according to the law of the particular sacrifice.*

So it was with the typical sacrifices, and the Eternal Son, Who in the counsels of God had given Himself before the foundation of the world, must, before He actually suffered, make a formal surrender of His Life, i.e., of His Body to be broken, and His Blood to be poured forth in death. This He must do Himself by a distinct act embodying the complete surrender of His Life, for until this was done no one could take His Life from Him, according to His own words: "*I* lay down My life"—no man taketh it from Me, but *I* lay it down of Myself.†

* Take, for instance, the first offering mentioned in Leviticus i., i.e., the burnt offering. "If any of you bring an offering unto the Lord," here is the intention recognized, "he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And he shall put his hand on the head of the burnt-offering and it shall be accepted for him." Here is the actual offering on the part of the worshipper, i.e., the formal surrender for a religious purpose of the victim by its owner. After this, and distinct from it, but absolutely necessary, comes the priestly part in bringing the blood and sprinkling it round about, and doing whatever else was required by the law.

† Let the reader notice how strongly this absolute power to retain His Life is emphasized in the original Greek by the pronoun ἐγὼ being expressed; not, as is usual, understood. ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχήν μου, ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτὴν ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ (John x. 17, 18).

In ordaining, then, that we should do what He did, i.e., take bread, break it, and say over it the words which He said; and take the cup and say over it the words which He said; in ordaining this, I say, He ordained a repetition both of the act and of the words by which He *offered* Himself for us.

So that every time we "do this" we do the same act, and we say the same words as He, our Great High Priest, did and said when He was making the act of surrender which was to be immediately and necessarily followed by His apprehension and His actual immolation on the Cross.

2. But the sacrificial significance of the words and acts in which our Lord instituted the Eucharist is immeasurably increased if we consider the time at which it all took place; for He ordained this perpetual repetition of His word and act not at an indifferent time, but at the time of the Passover, i.e., at the most sacrificial of all times; for the Paschal season was sacrificial in itself; and that particular Paschal season exceeded all others in sacrificial grace, because in it the very Paschal Lamb of God was offered for all sin.

By ordaining the repetition of that act by which He made Himself the Paschal Lamb, he ordained a perpetual Christian Passover, and a perpetual Christian Passover, not upon many Paschal lambs, but upon Himself as the one Antitype of all Paschal lambs.

If any one would realize the import of the fact that all this was done at the great Paschal solemnity, let him imagine, if it be lawful to do so, what we should have lost if our Lord had been crucified at some other time, or if He had ordained the Eucharistic commemoration of Himself at some other time—say, after His Resurrection. *It is not* too much to say that if it had

been so, our whole conception of Him as the Paschal Lamb would have been weakened, if not lost; for the sacrifice of the Passover was so connected with a particular season, that we could hardly have recognised Him as our Paschal Lamb, unless He had suffered at that season. But to regard Him as the Paschal Lamb is to regard Him under that aspect which, more than all others, sets forth His redeeming deliverance of His people from the bondage of Satan.*

The institution of the Eucharist at the particular moment at which the Lord ordained it, forces on the thoughtful Christian the conclusion that our Lord was there and then giving Himself as the true Paschal Lamb to be once for all slain in sacrifice, and to be for ever after presented and set forth before God in mystery, and to be partaken of by His people as their spiritual food. For when Christ said, "Take, eat, this is My Body," the remains of the body of a lamb of sacrifice were actually on the table before them, and they had just eaten of it in order that they might acknowledge before God and men their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and that they might be assured of their continuing in the church and covenant of Israel. Christ chose this very time as the one in which to supersede the type by the antitype, and that antitype Himself as our Passover, and that new and better Passover also to be taken and eaten spiritually and sacramentally, and

* Suppose, for instance, that our Lord had suffered on the Great Day of Atonement, the idea of atonement as connected with His Death might have been as vivid, but it could have been connected with the sacrifices of a heifer and goats, not with the offering of an innocent lamb. And there would have been also this enormous difference, that on the great day of atonement there was a remembrance, or anamnesis, (Heb. x. 3) made of *sins*, whereas at the Passover there was an anamnesis *of mercy in deli*verance from bondage.

the same thing to be done in the taking and eating as He was Himself doing.

How, then, could His Church do otherwise than regard the whole act as sacrificial in the highest and most complete sense of the word? If He had abhorred the sacrificial idea of the Eucharist, as some now profess to do, why did He not ordain it at another time, and save His Church from the fearful temptation of speaking of a means of merely refreshing our memories as if it were a "tremendous" sacrifice?

3. But, above all, the words in which Christ commanded the perpetual celebration of this Sacrament showed that He instituted it for a sacrificial purpose, so that, however different in outward form, it should have the same purpose and intent as all former sacrifices, and that it should bring and represent before God the Father the Sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. Christ, in setting forth the end or purpose of the institution (in so far as it is an act of worship) used a word which is used in Scripture of sacrifices or sacrificial acts done as in the sight of God, and with a view to His acceptance. For when He said, "This do in remembrance of me," He used for remembrance the word "anamnesis," a word which, if we except the places in which it is applied to the Eucharist, occurs only three times in the word of God.

It occurs only once in the New Testament, and that is in Hebrews x. 3, "But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance" (or anamnesis) "again made of sins every year." The "remembrance," or "anamnesis," here mentioned refers to the purpose or intent of the sacrifices made once every year on the Great Day of Atonement, that in and through them there should be a *solemn* acknowledgment and confession to God of the

sins of the whole nation, in order that God of His mercy might blot them out. Nothing can exceed the clearness with which the Godward nature of the whole transaction is set forth.* The whole memorial and every part of it is to be made before God and God only.

First, the priest is to make with the slaughter of a bullock an atonement for himself and for his house. Such atonement, of course, can only be made to God. Then he is to bring incense within the vail, i.e., into the immediate presence of God, and he is to put the incense upon the fire before the Lord "that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony." All this, of course, being not only before God, but out of the sight of the people, because it was all done within the vail.

Then Aaron is to take the blood of the bullock and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat—then he is to bring the blood of the goat within the vail (verses 14, 15). And all this he is to do in order that he may "make an atonement for the holy place because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins," and the whole transaction is to be done so absolutely before God, and before Him alone, that "there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement," &c. (Levit. xvi. 17).

And the chapter concludes with the words to which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers when

* In Leviticus xvi. there seems to be a twofold account of the sacrifices of the Great Day of Atonement. From verses 5 to 10 inclusive there is a short summary, and from verse 11 to the end there are fuller and more minute directions respecting the ritual to be observed. *On this account* I begin with verse 11.

he speaks of the continual repetition of these sacrifices, "This shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year." Is it not well nigh incredible that there should be men who, in order to avoid the conclusion that the anamnesis in the Lord's Supper is before God, actually assert that this anamnesis of the sins of Israel once a year was simply a transaction before men, in order to remind them, or that they might remind themselves, of sin?

The word "anamnesis" is used four times in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, but two of these instances occur in the titles of Psalms. It is used in connection with the offering of the ordinary Jewish sacrifices in Numbers x. 10, "Ye shall blow with the trumpets over your burnt-offerings, and over the sacrifices of your peace-offerings, that they may be to you for a memorial before your God (*καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν ἀνάμνησις ἔναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν*).

It is used also in connection with the shewbread in Levit. xxiv. 6. "And thou shalt set them in two rows, six on a row, upon the pure table before the Lord. And thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row, that it may be on the bread for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord (*καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ἄρτους εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκείμενα τῷ* Κυρίῳ.)

The two other instances are in the headings of Psalms; one in that of Psalm xxxviii. (xxxvii. of Septuagint), the other in that of Psalm lxx. (lxix. Septuagint). These Psalms are both of them addressed to God, and are Psalms of penitential confession of sin and deprecation of His anger, and are not even in form addressed to the congregation, as are the seventy-eighth *and eighty-second.*

So that if we are to be guided in ascertaining the meaning of the word which our Lord used to express "remembrance" from its sense in every other place of scripture in which it occurs, we must regard it as indicating a memorial, or remembrance, or anamnesis before God in the same sense in which the most solemn sacrifices of the Jews were memorials before God; with this enormous difference, however, that whilst they were memorials of sins unatoned for, our Eucharist is the memorial or representation of Him in Whom we have redemption from sin.

In "Scripture Truth"

VI.

EXAMINATION OF THE WORDS "WE HAVE AN ALTAR."

WE have now to consider the scope and bearing of a passage which, if we take into account the extreme fewness of the times in which the public Church worship of the Apostolic Christians is alluded to in Scripture, cannot be safely left out of account.

This place is Hebrews xiii. 10: "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle."

Those who believe that the Eucharist is in some important sense sacrificial, of course interpret the word "altar" here as signifying the table which always has been the ritual centre of the celebration of the sacramental rite. Those who deny that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, say that the apostle here means some figurative or metaphorical altar, but upon what this is they are not agreed.

Some say that this altar is the actual Cross upon Mount Calvary: and of course the Cross is in the highest sense the one Christian altar, but then is the sacrifice upon the Cross to be commemorated and to be partaken of? Our Lord ordained that it should be commemorated in Christian assemblies, not by mere verbal acts, but by the outward visible act of breaking of bread. This bread, being an outward visible *substance, must rest* upon something whilst it, or a part

of it, is being broken. It is, moreover, blessed and broken in order that afterwards it may be taken and eaten as the Body of Christ. So that, just as the bread corresponds to our Lord's Blessed Body, and just as the breaking of the bread corresponds to the sufferings, i.e., the breaking or wounding of our Lord's Body on the Cross, so the table on which this mystical bread rests, on which it is broken, and from which it is taken to be eaten, corresponds to the Cross itself. The table, then, is necessarily a mystical representation of the altar of the Cross, and so is an altar in a far higher sense than the altar from which the Jews eat when they foreshadowed the Death of Christ.

Others, seeing the danger to their opinions of thus interpreting this "altar" as the actual Cross, affirm that it is Christ Himself Who, they say, is at once our Priest, our Sacrifice, and also our Altar; but such an opinion, however pious it may sound, is simply an absurdity, for though Christ was at once the Priest and the Victim, He was not His own altar, i.e., His own Cross. "He Himself bare our sin in His own body on the *Tree*." The tree was not Christ. The atoning Death of the Son of God being the painful, violent death of a human body, required physical instruments by which it could be inflicted, and one of these was the Cross; and similarly, the commemoration of Himself, which our Lord ordained, was a commemoration in the devout use of outward visible signs, which necessitate the use of outward visible instruments, one of which is an altar or table; an altar, in so far as it is the instrument for a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving—a table in so far as it is an instrument for devout Communion.*

* I am aware that the name of Waterland can be pleaded for the interpretation *that Christ is* our altar as well as priest and sacrifice;

I am ashamed to take up the reader's time with shewing the absurdity of such opinions; but, as I said at the outset of this section, the references to distinctively Christian worship in the New Testament are so few that the sense of each one becomes important, as fixing the meaning of the remainder.

Let us then, first of all, observe that if this place had occurred in any other book, Jewish or Christian, we should, without the slightest hesitation, have understood the author to mean an actual altar; for a recognised part of sacrificial worship, both amongst Jews and heathen, was the partaking of that which had been offered in sacrifice upon an altar. So that both amongst Jews and Gentiles the words "table" and "altar" were interchangeable. Thus the prophets Ezekiel and Malachi call the altar on which the Jewish sacrifices were offered the Lord's Table,* and, conversely, St. Paul calls the

---

but they who cite his authority ought in fairness to let their readers know that he begins his chapter on "The Service of the Eucharist considered in a Sacrificial View," with the words: "That the Sacrament of the Eucharist, in whole or in part, in a sense proper or improper, is a Sacrifice of the Christian Church, is a point agreed upon among all knowing and sober divines, Popish, Lutheran, or Reformed." And again he writes in the same chapter: "The service, therefore, of the Eucharist, on the foot of ancient Church Language, is both a true and a proper sacrifice (as I shall shew presently), and the noblest we are capable of offering, when considered as comprehending under it many true and Evangelical Sacrifices."

If we are to set name against name, then that of Richard Baxter may be cited against Waterland in favour of the natural interpretation of this altar of Heb. xiii. "The naming of the table an altar, as related to the representative Sacrifice, is no more improper than the other. 'We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat' (Heb. xiii. 10), seems plainly to mean the Sacramental Communion." (Baxter's 'Christian Institutes,' i. p. 304.)

* "But the priests, the Levites, the Sons of Zadok, that kept the *charge of my sanctuary* . . . . they shall stand before me to offer the

actual altars of heathen gods the tables of devils, when he writes, "Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils" (1 Cor. x. 21).

To call the Lord's table an altar, is strictly in accordance with the prophecies of Christian worship, which foretell that that worship would be sacrificial; and it is assuredly in accordance with the terms in which Christian worship is spoken of by every early Christian writer.

The only reason which men can bring forward for refusing to recognise the altar of Hebrews xiii. as the Lord's table, arises from a distorted and superficial view of the design of the sacred writer in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

It is alleged by them that the writer cannot mean that Christians have an altar in their churches, because Christ, the Great High Priest, offered once for all an all-sufficient Sacrifice, and so for ever did away with all subordinate priesthood and sacrifice.

But to enforce such a conclusion, it would have been needful for the apostolic writer to have laid down very different premises to those which he has laid down. It would have been needful for him to have shown, not only that our Great High Priest has offered an all-sufficient Sacrifice to which nothing can be added, but also that any representation, or anamnesis, or commemoration of that sacrifice in the use of material things, such as bread and wine, was unlawful in the

---

fat and the blood . . . . they shall enter into my sanctuary; and they shall come near to my table." προσελεύσονται πρὸς τὴν τραπεζάν μου, τοῦ λειτουργεῖν μοι (Ezek. xliv. 16). "Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar: and ye say, wherein have we polluted thee?" In that ye say the table of the Lord is contemptible." (θυσιαστήριόν μου . . . . τράπεζα Κυρίου. Mal. i. 7.)

Christian Church; for any such anamnesis or commemoration of the Sacrifice of Christ would, in that age of the Church, be certain to be called a sacrifice.

The scope and design of the Epistle to the Hebrews may be thus stated. The Hebrew Christians had continued from the first devout worshippers in the temple. We read (Acts xxi. 20) that there was a vast number of believing Jews (*πόσαι μυριάδες εἰσὶν Ἰουδαίων τῶν πεπιστευκότων*) who were all zealous for the law. We read that they continued daily in the temple, that is, they took part in worship not distinctively Christian, and yet they continued steadfastly in the "breaking of bread," i.e., in distinctively Christian worship. This mixture, if not of two religions, yet of two forms of worship, seems very strange to us; but, nevertheless, it is one of the most undoubted facts of early Christian history. When, however, this Epistle was being written, this blending of the two religious systems was coming to an end; for, in the first place, the heads of the Jewish system were excluding the Christians from the worship of the temple, and, in the second place, the whole Jewish system, being "decayed," was about to "vanish away" (Heb. viii. 13). The Hebrew Christians were consequently under a twofold temptation. They were under the temptation, occasioned by their forced exclusion from the rites of a religion for which they were all zealous, of apostatizing to the more powerful and more pretentious system; and, in the second place, inasmuch as their faith had to some extent rested on that part of their religious system which was about to vanish away, that faith itself was in danger. To save them from this peril of making shipwreck of their faith, the apostolic writer addressed himself to show *them that the* religious system from which they were

being excluded was imperfect, temporary, and insufficient; whereas the Christian system which was succeeding it was perfect, eternal, and all-sufficient. He showed them how the Old Testament itself bore witness to the inherent imperfection and temporary character of the Levitical ministrations, for it contained a distinct intimation that God would raise up another Priest, after the order of Melchizedec, and not after the order of Aaron: this supercession of the Aaronic priesthood proving its imperfection. Then the priest after the order of Melchizedec was not to be removed by death, as the Aaronic priests were (Heb. vii. 23, 24, 25). And, above all, the Levitical priest offered many sacrifices, and year by year entered into the Holy Place with blood of others, thereby proving the insufficiency of his offering, whereas our High Priest entered in once into the Holiest Place of Heaven itself, having obtained eternal redemption for us (Heb. ch. ix.).

Of what, then, is the scope and tenor of the Epistle to the Hebrews condemnatory? Evidently of anything whatsoever which would be a repetition of the Sacrifice of the Cross, or of any fresh immolation (if such a thing could ever be imagined) of the Body of the Son of God, or of anything which might be considered supplementary to the One Sacrifice, as if the Sacrifice of Christ were not all-sufficient, or as if anything could by any possibility be added to Its atoning virtue.

Against all such ideas of sacrifice, whether in or out of the Eucharist, this Epistle is of course directed; but it is not directed against any view of the Eucharist as a means by which that one all-sufficient Sacrifice is to be commemorated, pleaded, and applied.

We can illustrate the bearing of the whole argument of the Epistle on the subject of the sacrificial character

of the Eucharist by considering the meaning of one verse, where the writer says, "By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. ch. x. 14). No ultra-Calvinist has ever taught that from the time of Christ's offering His one Offering He has so perfected the individuals amongst His elect that they need no conversion, no application of, or washing in, His Blood; that they have no occasion spiritually to eat His Flesh and to drink His Blood; and that all pleading of His Atonement in their private prayers is superfluous, and derogatory to the all-sufficiency of His Offering.

The most determined opponents of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist insist that if a sinner is to be saved, that sinner must plead and remind God of, and thank God for, the Sacrifice of Christ; and this each sinner must do for himself in the recesses of his own heart, apart from, and unconnected with, the Eucharist; and we go a step further and insist also that the Church gathered together must plead, and remind God of, and thank God for, the Sacrifice of Christ, in, and through, and by the Eucharist.

Now, in so far as in the Eucharist we plead and commemorate and thank God for the one all-sufficient Sacrifice, we acknowledge it to be a Sacrifice, just as when we partake of the Body and Blood of Christ therein we acknowledge it to be a Communion.

And so in all reason we must understand this altar as the table on which, and by which, the memorial of the one Sacrifice is made before God and men.

It seems to me the most absurd anachronism to credit the writer of this Epistle with the same antipathy to *sacrificial* terms, as applied to Christian worship, which *has prevailed in* certain Protestant bodies of Western

Europe and America since the time of the Reformation: an antipathy absolutely unknown to any other part of the world, or in any other age of the Church. An antipathy, for instance, unknown to the early heretics, such as the Nestorians and Eutychians, who used Liturgies as sacrificial in their terms as those of the Orthodox; an antipathy unshared by the Lutherans, and wholly confined to the ultra-Protestant bodies of Zurich and Geneva, to whose influence alone the anti-sacrificial views of our own reformers, as well as those of the Scotch Kirk and the English Nonconformists, are to be traced.

It would require overwhelming evidence to make us believe that the scruples of certain Swiss divines of Zurich or Geneva were anticipated by a writer living in an atmosphere of religious thought so totally different from theirs. For the religious atmosphere of the Swiss Reformation was simply Anti-Sacramental Predestinarianism, whereas of all writers in the Sacred Canon the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is the most Anti-Predestinarian in his conceptions of Divine Truth. It is he who dwells so solemnly on the example of the Israelites failing to attain to the promised land as a warning to Christians lest they should fail in like manner (ch. iii. iv.). It is he who presumes that some who have been partakers of the Holy Ghost may fall away irretrievably (vi. 4, 5, 6), and that they who sin wilfully after they have received the knowledge of the truth, and have been washed in the Blood of Christ, may cut themselves off from God's mercy (x. 26-29), and cites Esau as an example of one who threw away a birthright, lest we also should throw away our birthright (xii.). And, so far from being Anti-Sacramental, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews enumerates

six principles of the doctrine of Christ, two of which are the "doctrine of baptisms" and of "Laying on of hands" (vi. 1, 2), and tells us that the new and living way to God was *through the flesh* of Christ (x. 20), a mode of expressing access to God which no Anti-Sacramentalist would think of employing.

VII.

THE EUCHARIST IN CONNECTION WITH THE MEDIATION OF CHRIST.

LET us now briefly recapitulate.

We have seen how our branch of the Catholic Church, in common with every other, regards the Eucharist as the most solemn act of Christian worship.

We have seen how the New Testament teaches us that the one great object for which Christians met in their own assemblies for worship was the celebration of the Eucharist.

We have seen how the prophets of the Old Testament foretell the worship of the Church of Christ under images taken from their own Church worship, which was essentially sacrificial.

We have seen how this affected the views and expressions of the earliest Christian writers, who cited these sacrificial images in the Prophetical Books as having their fulfilment in the Eucharist.

We then considered what it is which vindicates the prophets and early fathers in regarding the Eucharist as a Sacrifice, and this can only be the terms in which the Son of God ordained this service as a "perpetual memory" of His Death, considered in connection with the time at which He ordained it, and the purpose or end for which He ordained it. And we have noticed how the writer in the Sacred Canon who, above all others, *sets forth* the all-sufficiency of the Priesthood

of the Son of God, viz., the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, distinctly recognizes that Christians, inasmuch as they set forth the Lord's Death in the rite which He has enjoined, must have an altar, an altar from which all are excluded who confess not the One Priest and the One Sacrifice.

We have now to enter into the very heart of this deep and awful subject, and consider how it is that a rite, which has not one outward feature in common with the sacrifices of the old dispensation, is yet the best and holiest of all possible acts of sacrificial worship.

This it is because it is the offering of Christ by His Church, so far as He can now be offered; for it is His Church on earth, by a Church act, uniting herself and her worship with what He, as our High Priest, is now doing in heaven.

The Offering of Himself on the part of the Son of God, inasmuch as He is the Eternal Word, is independent of time, and is, like Himself, eternal.

But, inasmuch as the Son of God is also the Son of Man, having taken our nature in the fulness of time, His Offering was consummated at a particular moment of time when He said "It is finished." This we gather from the words of the Apostolic writer in the Epistle to the Hebrews. We read there the words "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the Body of Christ once for all" (Heb. x. 10).

Now, the Will of God the Father that His Son should take our nature to reconcile the world to God—and the Will of God the Son in submitting to do this Will of *God the* Father, was the eternal purpose of God. The *Lamb without blemish* and without spot, was "verily

fore-ordained before the foundation of the world" (1 Peter i. 20). This Will, whether we regard it as the Will of the Father in ordaining the Sacrifice, or the Will of the Son in submitting to be the Sacrifice, is eternal; and so the Offering of the Son is essentially eternal.

But though in will and purpose and intention it must be eternal, being in the mind of the Being Who inhabits eternity, yet it must be fulfilled in time, because the Son of God could not actually suffer death till He had assumed a nature capable of death, and even then could not suffer death till He Himself laid down His Life.

In fulfilment of the Will of God He did then lay down His Life once and once only, and made by that one Offering a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for all sin.

His Eternal Will, then, was effectual to our sanctification through the offering of His Body upon the Cross.

We must now ask, I trust with all reverence, the question, How does the offering of the Body of Christ sanctify? Evidently not by the Offering of the sufferings of the Body of Christ apart from His Eternal Will, but by the offering of His Body broken, and His Blood shed in death, as the sign and pledge of His perfect submission to the Divine Will: His Body and His Blood, separated in death, were the outward visible signs of an inward Will which so perfectly submitted to God as patiently to endure sufferings the prospect of which wrung from Him His Bloody Sweat.

It was not the mere Will ending in no submission to death, neither was it the mere Breaking of the Body and the Shedding of the Blood preceded by no eternal

surrender of Himself; but it was the deliberate Will so perfectly at one with the Will of God His Father as willingly to endure a cruel death, which constituted the atoning Sacrifice.

I have dwelt thus particularly upon Our Lord's offering being necessarily an offering in Will before it could be an offering in Act, because it will serve to fix the reader's attention on this most essential point, that in one sense Our Lord's Offering must be, like Himself, Eternal; or, at least, coeval with the conflict between good and evil. How could He be the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world?" Because He was the "Lamb fore-ordained before the foundation of the world" (1 Pet. i. 20).

He was the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," not because certain sacrifices of lambs typified His Sufferings, but because it was His Will to suffer; and these sacrifices of lambs would not have been ordained, unless His Father had accepted this submission of His Will. If He had not thus offered Himself from the foundation of the world, the sacrifice of these creatures would have had nothing corresponding to them in the Breast of God, but because He did thus offer Himself, they were effectual for the atoning purposes for which God ordained them.

So that the Son of God is the Eternal Priest, His ministration reaching back into the ages past as well as into those which are to come.

So that the ministrations of the Aaronic priests depended upon and set forth that Will which was to culminate in submission to the Death upon the Cross.

When, then, the Sacrifice upon the Cross was completed, did He cease to be a priest; or, at least, did He *cease to act as a priest* in that very ministration which,

according to the apostle, was the characteristic work of the priest? That is, did He cease to offer? for the apostle lays down that a priest "must have somewhat to offer." * Now, in order to answer this question, we must ask and answer two others. "Did He cease to mediate?" Of course every Christian would answer "God forbid. We depend for all things upon His Mediation." Well, then, the next question is, "What form does His Mediation now assume?" or rather, "Under what form is it presented to us?" so that we can form some conception of it. What it is in itself is known only to the Persons in the Trinity; but the form in which it is presented to us is undoubtedly a sacrificial form; for St. John sees in a vision of the heaven of heavens, in the midst of the throne, and of the four living creatures, and of the elders, a "Lamb as it had been slain": slain, of course, sacrificially, and as thus sacrificially slain glorified by the heavenly hosts. "Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us unto God by Thy Blood," "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain" (Rev. v. 6, 9, 11).

Whatever be the actual reality of this vision, the import of it as regards ourselves it is impossible to mistake; for here is the Eternal Son of God, in the midst of the very throne of God, exhibiting the marks and tokens of a Sacrificial Death. He appears not only as the Lamb, but the Lamb as it had been slain; or rather "a Lamb standing as slain," for in the original

ἀρνίον ἑστηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον

* "For every High Priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins" (Heb. v. 1). "For every High Priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law" (*Heb. viii. 3, 4*).

the word "standing" comes after the word "Lamb," and so emphasizes the contrast between the marks of death and the attitude of standing, which belongs to one in life. St. Augustine, in referring to this place, writes, "Christ stands before the throne of God as our advocate interceding for us."

Now, I say that the teaching of this vision cannot be mistaken. Whatever be the reality underlying these mysterious images, they teach us that our Great High Priest now mediates for us through His Sacrificial Death. His very Death lives and pleads. "The Blood of sprinkling speaketh yet." It did not speak once only, it yet *speaks.**

The following may serve to bring out more fully this precious truth. It is conceivable that our Blessed Lord

* λαλοῦντι, present participle. Alford has a remarkably suggestive note, "The writer, enumerating the great differences of our Sion from their Sinai, though he has not recounted their blood of sprinkling, as not being worthy of mention in the face of the terrors of God's law, mentions ours, by which we were redeemed unto God, and assigns it a place in the Heavenly City, next to, but separate from, Jesus Himself in His glorified state. If we come to enquire how this can be, we enter on an interesting but high and difficult subject, on which learned and holy men have been much divided. Our Lord's Blood was shed from Him on the cross. And as His Body did not see corruption, it is obvious to suppose that His Blood did not corrupt as that of ordinary men, being, as it is, so important a portion of the body. Hence, and because His resurrection Body seems to have been bloodless (see Luke xxiv. 39; John xx. 27, and notes), some have supposed that the Blood of the Lord remains, as it was poured out, incorruptible in the presence of God. On such a matter I would neither affirm nor deny, but mention, with all reverence that which seems to suit the requirements of the words before us. By that Blood we live, wherever it is: but as here it is mentioned separately from the Lord Himself, as an item in the glories of the heavenly city, and as 'yet speaking,' it seems to require some such view to account for the words used. *Benzel has here* a long excursus on the point in which he takes *strongly the above view.*" Dean Jackson takes the same view.

might have been seen by St. John as arrayed in all the glory of the Godhead, all marks of past suffering and humiliation being wholly obliterated; but it is not so. With whatever glory He is now encircled, in this glory is clearly discernible the memory of the past Sufferings and sacrificial Death, and not merely the memory of them, but the visible setting of them forth.

So that the Mediation of Christ is in this vision exhibited to us as the most energetic representation conceivable of His Sacrificial Death.

Just then, as before His Incarnation, He was in Will and Intention the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, and the earthly worship ordained by God was the counterpart of this, serving (as the apostle writes) to the example and shadow of this most heavenly Thing; so now He appears on the throne of God as the Lamb actually slain, and the Eucharistic worship which He has ordained is, we verily believe, the re-presentation and counterpart of this His Presentation of Himself as our Mediator in heaven.

This atoning Sacrifice was complete when He cried, "It is finished," but the exhibition, the re-presentation, the setting of it forth, constitutes His mediatorial work in heaven; that is, the work of His Everlasting Priesthood. Being a true Priest He has indeed "somewhat to offer," only before His Incarnation He offered His Death in will and intention, now He offers it as accomplished. That is, He mediates through a Death which, once for all, took place, but by bearing the marks of it in His glorified human Nature He makes that which is past, present, and *presents* it. This heavenly vision must have, as its reality, something far more than a mere verbal calling *to mind* or pleading of a past death; for there is

the visible representation of Death in Life: the "Lamb stands as slain." His very Presence pleads His past all-atoning Death.

But is this the only form under which His Mediation is presented to us? By no means. His Offering of Himself to God did not end with the Sacrifice of His Death, neither is it exhausted by the presentation of Himself as the Lamb slain; for with His Resurrection He began a New Life also devoted and offered to God. "In that He liveth, He liveth unto God."

His Mediation is now not only the representation of His past Death, but of His present Life, i.e., of Himself as alive from the dead. But there is this great difference between the two, that in the presentation of the memory or anamnesis of His Death, He presents It alone, "I have trodden the winepress alone." He presents before God the one Offering of Himself once offered as the full and perfect expiatory sacrifice, but in the Presentation of Himself as alive, He presents His people in Himself; for He is in heaven on the right hand of God as the Head of His Church.

Let us reverently consider the bearing of this. Whatever lower forms the Mediation of Christ may take, the greatest and highest must of necessity be His appearance on the throne of God as the Head of His Mystical Body. The popular idea of the Mediation of Christ is as of one interceding for a number of individual souls, virtually separate from the Intercessor and from One another. But the idea in the New Testament is of One standing before God, having His people in Him: because He is the Head and they are the members: so that He and His Church are one organization; almost, *in a* sense, one person, according to the words of the *apostle: "As the* body is one and hath many members,

and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ;" not merely Christ's Church, but Christ.

Now this, if it be a reality, must, of necessity, constitute the highest form which the Mediation of Christ can possibly assume; for if mediation consists in bringing together, and opening a communication between, those that are apart, then Christ, by making Himself the Head of us, His Mystical Body, makes the most direct and intimate communication conceivable between God and us; for God is in Christ, and we are in Christ according to His own words: "I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one" (John xvii. 23); and again, "I am in My Father and ye in Me, and I in you" (John xiv. 20); and again, in the words of the apostle, "I would have you know that the Head of every man is Christ; . . . and the Head of Christ is God" (1 Cor. xi. 3).

Such, then, is the Mediation of our High Priest. It exhibits itself as twofold—the presentation of a past Death under the form of a Lamb standing as slain—the presentation of the devotion and energies of a present Life, which includes the life of His People, who have their life hid with Him because they are in Him as the members of His Body (Col. iii. 3).

And the Eucharist, which He has ordained as the great act of worship of His Church, most closely corresponds with both these forms of His priestly Mediation; for it, too, has a twofold aspect, or rather function. By it we show forth the Lord's Death, for we make the perpetual memory or anamnesis of it till His coming again, answering to His own Presentation of Himself before God on our behalf as the Lamb standing as slain. In it, too, God assures us who have "duly

received these holy mysteries that "we are very members incorporate in the Mystical Body of His Son," according to the words of the apostle, "We being many are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread." And this corresponds with His Presentation of Himself at the right hand of God as the Head of His Body the Church.

This is brought out remarkably clearly in certain well-known words of St. Augustine, where, speaking of our Lord being both the Priest, inasmuch as He Himself makes the offering, and also the Oblation, he writes: "The whole Congregation and Society of the Saints is offered to God as an universal Sacrifice by its great High Priest, Who also offered up Himself in His Passion for us, that we might be the Body of so great an Head." De Civitate Dei, x. 6.

VIII.

CHRIST THE PRIEST IN EVERY EUCHARIST.

THE Mediation of Christ is the act of His everlasting Priesthood. He is on the throne of God as our High Priest. It is also a continuous priestly act, for He is a "Priest for ever"; and it is a human Priesthood, having its human as well as its Divine side, for He is a "Priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedec." As He assumed the nature of man, and so bears a name which another of His servants bare, so He exercises a Priesthood which in some mysterious way one of our race exercised before Him. Now, just as it is no derogation from His Glory as the One Priest of the human race that He should exercise the office of a human priest who preceded Him, so it is no derogation from His Glory as the One Priest, but rather an enhancement of that Glory, to say that He can exercise the same everlasting Priesthood by the hands of His ministers whom He has sent.

To the exercise of His Priesthood in heaven we join ourselves by the celebration of the Sacrament of His Body and Blood on earth. If He be now making a perpetual memorial of His Sufferings in heaven by appearing there before God as a "Lamb standing as slain," which He is, and if He has commanded that we should make on earth a memorial before God of His

Sufferings as the Lamb of God, the one must be the counterpart of the other, that is, the representation in earthly forms, and under a veil, of what in heaven is in heavenly form and without a veil. If we say that it is not so, we violently part asunder what God has joined together, for the work of Christ has so joined heaven and earth, that Christ is here on earth in His Church and in its several members, and we, even now, are actually raised up together with Him, and made to sit together with Him in heavenly places (Ephes. ii. 6).

If we are to believe the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, earthly worship is after the pattern of heavenly (viii. 5): it serves "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things."

Now, whatever figurative element there may be in all this, we are surely taught by it that there is a very deep correspondence between earthly and heavenly worship; but, then, what is the heavenly worship with which we, as sinners, have to do? Not with the songs of the angels, or even with the Trisagion of the living creatures, but with the great mediatorial action of our High Priest standing in priestly attitude as the Lamb slain. This is the worship through which we approach God, and the worship of the Church on earth which Christ has ordained must correspond with it: if it does not, then we are landed in the absurd and blasphemous conclusion that the Jewish worship was more heavenly than the Christian, for we have the word of the apostle that the abrogated Jewish rites "served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." But if our Eucharist does correspond to the priestly action of Christ, and is a representation of it, then Christ is in very deed the One Priest both in heaven and on earth; in *heaven presenting* Himself unveiled, and on earth also

presenting Himself, but under the veil, the human priests being but His instruments.*

If it be not so: if, that is, the celebration of the Eucharist be not specially connected with the priestly action of our Lord, then the ministers of Christ here below are independent priests, exercising a priesthood of their own, because very remotely, if at all, the counterpart of what their Lord is doing in heaven. Do what they will, the ministers of Christ must be priests, for on the lowest estimate of their office they do greater things than any other human priests have ever been commissioned to do. If they make any anamnesis before God in the Eucharist, they do an act which is far more closely connected with the One Sacrifice of the One Eternal Priest than any other outward act ever commanded by God or man. Whether they make it as the representatives of Christ, or the representatives of the people, they are priests, if a priest be one who acts for God towards the people, and for the people towards God.

What, then, is the idea of the Christian priesthood, or, if you prefer it, "ministration." Is it simply earthly, deriving all its efficacy from the holiness or fervour of individual ministers, or is it the action of

* Why should this be thought a hard thing in respect of the Eucharist, when we confess it freely in respect of other ordinances. In Baptism we set forth Christ as the only real Baptiser when we address the sponsors of each child in such words as "Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe that He will likewise favourably receive this present infant, that He will embrace him with the arms of His mercy," &c. Again, all sects and parties, except Socinians and Rationalists, believe that Christ preaches and instructs by the lips of His ministers. Why should His priestly function be excluded from the Eucharist, but, if it be not, then He must be the one priest in every Eucharist which is *celebrated* according to His institution.

the One Omnipotent Priest, just as much present as Priest, as He is as Teacher and King?

This latter view does seem to add immeasurably to the dignity and grace of the great act of Christian worship, whilst it deprives it of all independent value. It is in deep spiritual accord with that vast mass of Scripture truth with which the Gospel of St. John and the Epistles of St. Paul abound, that Christ is Head of the Church, and she is His Body, so that He and she make up one whole or organization, for the Church is His Fulness, so that just as now His Church is present in heaven in Him, and He presents her in Himself, so He is present on earth wheresoever His Church is gathered together in His Name; so that in each assembly He is present to present to God her prayers, her praises, and above all her Eucharistic Act, whereby the individual members of the Church are continued in mystical union with Him, and with one another.

IX.

THE PRIESTLY ACT OF CHRIST A CONTINUOUS ACT.

It is often said that the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews is against such views as these, because it teaches us that Christ offered Himself once for all on the Cross, which of course it does teach. But, on the contrary, we assert that the Epistle to the Hebrews necessitates the Catholic view, for if this Epistle teaches us one truth more plainly than another, that truth is, that Christ is a "Priest for ever." The anti-Catholic view is that Christ, having once offered Himself on the Cross, has long ceased to offer anything; so that, in fact, He is now a priest only in name, whereas the Catholic view is, that being a "Priest for ever," He must do for ever a characteristically priestly act; and consequently, according to the same epistle, "He must have now somewhat to offer."

The difference between these two views will appear if we examine the true bearing of one passage: "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; nor yet that He should offer himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others. For then must He often have suffered since the *foundation* of the world: but now once in the

end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself," &c. (Heb. x. 24–27).

Here we have the contrast drawn out between the High Priest, on the one hand, slaying the sacrifice prescribed for the Day of Atonement, entering with its blood into the Most Holy Place within the veil, and presenting that blood before the Mercy Seat, then coming out again, and a year afterwards offering another sacrifice: and, on the other hand, our High Priest offering His own Blood on the Cross, then, on His Ascension, entering within the heavenly veil, presenting Himself before God, and not coming out again, but remaining within the veil. What we contend for is, that the priestly action of our Lord, which answers to the priestly action of the Jewish priest once a year within the veil, is, on our Lord's part, not a momentary or temporary, but a continuous action, and this forms its principal point of contrast with the corresponding act of the Jewish priest. The Jewish priest, having shed the blood of his victim, entered for but a short time into the Holiest, and came out again, in order to offer again the next year a similar sacrifice. During the short time that he was within the veil he was performing the highest act of his priesthood; but, inasmuch as the priesthood was imperfect, the blood ignoble, and the atonement made by it of little comparative worth, he could not continue in the Holiest, but must emerge again, to offer another sacrifice, and another, and another, till he himself was removed by death; but, on the contrary, our High Priest *continues* in the Holiest, because He has no need to come forth to shed blood again, because He has once for all shed His Blood in a Sacrifice of infinite worth.

What, then, is He doing within the veil? He is

evidently performing a continuous act, answering to the momentary act which the Jewish high priest did during the very short time that he was within the earthly veil. The Jewish high priest then presented the blood which he had shed without the veil, and our Lord is now presenting within the veil the sacrifice which He made on the Cross. Christ did not do this once only, when on His Ascension He reached the throne of God, and then ceased: if so, He would have long ceased to mediate through His Passion; but He is now performing the act of His Everlasting Priesthood. He *now* appears in the presence of God. He now shows Himself as the Lamb sacrificed and yet alive, alive and yet sacrificed. And all is of course for us. If He appeared for Himself alone, He would appear only in glory, but as it is for us sinners that He appears, He appears in all His Glory as a Sacrifice.

If it be urged against all this that our Lord's Priesthood is fulfilled sufficiently by acts of simple intercession, we answer, most emphatically, "No;" for the same Scriptures which reveal to us Christ's Intercession, teach us very distinctly that it takes a priestly form. It is not only the intercession of a friend for friends, but rather of a priest for those on whose behalf he acts in his capacity as priest. Intercession may be the act of one who is not a priest, but our Blessed Lord's intercession is set before us as a special act performed by Him in virtue of His Everlasting Priesthood. "This man, because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable Priesthood. WHEREFORE He is also able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them" (Hebr. vii. 24, 25).

The idea of a priest engrained in the mind of this inspired writer is not that of one simply interceding,

but of One Who commends His Intercession by having somewhat to offer, and by offering it, for he writes: "Every High Priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices, wherefore IT IS OF NECESSITY that this man also have somewhat to offer" (viii. 3).

X.

THE SENSE IN WHICH THE EUCHARIST IS A SACRIFICE.

We have now to consider the particular sense in which the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice; and this is a matter of some difficulty, because of the confusion of terms; for a sacrifice is a religious act made up of several distinct parts, some one of which parts is often taken to express the whole.

Let us take the Burnt Offering, which is the sacrifice occupying the first place in the Book of Leviticus. It embodied four distinct acts. The offering, or presentation; the mactation, or slaying of the animal; the offering of the blood; and the consumption.

First, there was the offering, or presentation. This was the solemn surrender of the creature intended to be sacrificed.* Without this there could be no sacrifice as an acceptable act of religion; for this was the public expression of that "voluntary will" with which the owner of the creature brought it, and without

* In the case of the Burnt Offering, "He shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord. And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him" (Levit. i. 3, 4). For Peace Offering, see Levit. iii. 2. For Sin Offering for priest, Levit. iv. 3, 4; for congregation, iv. 14, 15; for ruler, iv. 23, 24; *for any of the* common people, iv. 28, 29.

which the whole transaction would have been a mockery. This first offering or presentation was performed by different persons, according as the sacrifice was a private or a more public one. When the sacrifice was brought by any private person, as the expression of his own sin or his own sense of mercy, the man who brought it must himself present it, and lay his hand upon it. If the congregation had sinned, then the elders of the congregation had to perform this part of the sacrifice (Levit. iv. 15). But if the sacrifice was a national act, as were the sacrifices on the great day of atonement, then the High Priest, as the representative of the whole people towards God, had to offer and present the sacrifice (Levit. xvi. 7, 21).

This solemn surrender virtually contained in itself, so far as the offerer was concerned, all the rest of the transaction. The man who offered it at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, offered it in order that it might be treated by others (i.e. by the priests) according to the law of the particular sacrifice he designed it to be. He ceased to have any more power over it, or any property in it; and if any part of it was afterwards given back to him to consume, it was given as from God, as the bread of God—as a holy thing to be reverently consumed in token that he was so reconciled to God that God had given to him food from His own table.*

II. After this came the mactation, or immolation, or slaying. This was in one sense *the* sacrifice, because without it the blood would not have been shed in death; and it was the blood shed in death respecting which

* On this account, the portion of each sacrifice which was to be eaten, was actually called "most holy," or "holy of holies" (Levit. ii. 10). The same name which was given to the "most holy place" in *Exod. xxvi. 33.*

God said, "The life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul" (Levit. xvii. 11).

III. In accordance with this there was a second presentation, or offering of the blood only;* and this was (considered ritually or liturgically) by far the most important part of the whole rite; for it was the solemn presentation, before God, of that thing which God had given to make atonement, and in the only form in which it could make atonement, i.e., as separated from the body through death.

IV. And, lastly, there was the consumption; in the case of the Burnt Offering alone, wholly by fire; in the case of other offerings, partly by fire, partly by the priests, or by the priests and worshippers; in the case of the Passover, wholly by the worshippers.

This consumption by fire is often taken to be the whole sacrifice, because it was the most conspicuous and imposing part of the ceremony, but, in reality, it was not merely only a part of one great whole, but it took place after the atoning work was completed, and it was ordained rather as a token of the acceptance of the

* In the case of the burnt offering, "The priests, Aaron's sons, shall bring the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar that is by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation" (Levit. i. 5). For the peace offering, see Levit. iii. 8, 13. In the case of the sin offering, "The priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord before the vail of the sanctuary: and the priest shall put some of the blood upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense before the Lord, which is in the tabernacle of the congregation; and shall pour all the blood of the bullock at the bottom of the altar of burnt offering" (Levit. iv. 6, 7; also, 17, 18, 25). In the offering on the day of atonement this presentation took place within the vail before the mercy seat itself (Levit. xvi. 14, 15, 16).

atonement than for the making of the atonement. For the atonement having been made and accepted, the victim was to be laid on God's table, i.e., on the altar, and if burnt up with fire, was supposed to be wholly devoted to God, and so was called "a sweet savour unto the Lord."*

In accordance with this view, when Aaron offered his first burnt offering, fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt offering (Levit. ix. 24). This fire was never allowed to go out, and from it every subsequent burnt offering was kindled. Because they kindled their burnt offering with other fire besides this, Nadab and Abihu perished (Levit. x. 1). Again, at the dedication of Solomon's temple, this fire was renewed from heaven (2 Chron. vii. 1); and when Elijah sacrificed, the token of acceptance was, that the fire of the Lord fell and consumed the burnt sacrifice (1 Kings xviii. 38).

* Perhaps it is on this principle that the part of the peace offering which was burnt on the altar was called "food of the offering made by fire unto the Lord," or more literally "food of fire" (Levit. iii. 11). Perhaps, too, on this account, the parts of the creature which was slain were not to be heaped up confusedly on the altar, but the priests, Aaron's sons, were to LAY IN ORDER the parts, the head, and the fat, upon the wood, that is, on the fire which is upon the altar: and other parts were to be washed before being placed on the altar (Levit. i, 8, 9). Perhaps, also, it was on this principle of what was consumed on the altar being accounted the food of God, that the salt of the covenant of God was never to be lacking on the meat offering, or, indeed, on any offering (Levit. ii. 13). Because of this, St. Paul warns the Corinthians in the words "Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table," i.e., the Christian altar, "and the table of devils." They who partook of the tables of devils were those who partook of the things sacrificed on the altars of the heathen gods, and so were accounted to be accepted worshippers of such gods; as those who *partook of the* One Sacrifice of the Lord's table were assumed to be *accepted worshippers of* the One true God.

So that if the sacrifice was wholly burnt, it was understood to be wholly consumed by God; if partially eaten by the priests, they were supposed to eat of the bread of God's table as the representatives of the people; if eaten by the people who brought the sacrifice, they were supposed to eat of God's table in token of reconciliation made by the blood of that devoted thing of whose flesh they partook.

Such was the Jewish sacrifice. Not a simple, but a compound act. It is abundantly clear that the word "offering," which in Leviticus i. is applied only to the bringing of the thing to be sacrificed, and to the formal presenting of it at the door of the tabernacle, would often be used to signify the whole, because it virtually included the whole;* and the word "sacrifice," which signifies "slaughtering," is often used for the whole rite, because by the slaying alone could the blood which made the atonement be poured forth, and the carcase be consumed or eaten.

Again, as is natural, the sacrifice or "zebach," signifies the victim only.

* It, of course, virtually included the whole so far as the individual offerer was concerned, because, not being a priest, he had nothing more to do with it. If anything needful to the validity of the act was omitted afterwards at the altar, it was not his fault; and so, as soon as he had done his part, by laying his hands upon its head, the promise would be fulfilled. "It shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him" (Levit. i. 4).

So Archdeacon Freeman, 'Principles of Divine Service': "The offerer brought the victim, a male of the flock or herd, just within (?) the door of the Tabernacle or Temple court, and there 'offered' or yielded it up of his own voluntary will; probably specifying what kind of sacrifice he designed it to be. This done, it was already accounted, as far as he was concerned, an accomplished offering or "gift"; and is thenceforth in the divine instructions called by its name, a burnt or (whole) offering"—(Vol. II. Part II. p. 236).

Again, the burning or consumption would often naturally stand for the whole, because, being the consummation, or sealing, as it were, of the whole, it would include all that had gone before it.

We now come to consider the One Great All-atoning Sacrifice, and we find that It also is a whole, having its 77 parts, which parts correspond to the various parts of the typical sacrifice.

First of all, there is the Presentation or Offering. In the case of our Lord, Who is the High Priest of the human race, this must be done by Himself, just as it was the Jewish high priest who had to offer and present the national offerings for sacrifice on the great day of atonement.

Now, inasmuch as our Lord is both God and man, this offering of Himself is twofold. One in the eternal Counsel of God, inasmuch as He is "the Lamb foreordained before the foundation of the world." This consisted in the submission of His Will to do His Father's Will, and so to resolve that in due time He would assume a nature in which it was possible for Him to suffer the all-atoning Death.

This is, so far as our present argument is concerned, admirably expressed by the poet Milton, perhaps the greatest anti-catholic name in all our literature. In the third Book of 'Paradise Lost' he describes God as observing Satan on his way to this world; as foreseeing the fall of man; as summoning the heavenly hosts, and demanding of them—

> "Which of you will be mortal to redeem
> Man's mortal crime, and just the unjust to save?"

And when all were silent, we have the Son coming

forward, and presenting Himself as the future Ransom, in the words:

> "Behold Me then, Me for him, Life for life
> I OFFER; on Me let thine anger fall:
> Account Me man; I for his sake will leave
> Thy bosom, and this glory next to Thee
> Freely put off, and for him lastly die
> Well pleased."

All this, of course, may be too anthropomorphic in its conception: but it seems well to illustrate the eternal aspect of our Lord's Offering; and, coming from a mind so intensely ultra-Protestant, seems to me exceedingly valuable. Let the reader notice that Milton uses the very word "offer"—

> "——— Life for life
> I offer."

So far for the eternal side of this offering. But He Who had thus offered Himself in the Counsels of God before all time, when He took upon Him our finite nature, which exists only in time, must have a time in which to offer or surrender His sacred Body to be broken, and His Blood to be shed.

And the time for this must have been the time when He took the bread, brake it, and said, "This is My Body which is [being] given for you."

For, at this time, He most certainly did, in some way, give or surrender His Body, for by the words He used He not only assumed that it would be given, but He implied that it was there and then being given: "This is My Body which is being given."

If, then, our Lord's Passion be properly called a sacrifice (in the sense of a religious act reconciling men to God) it must have features analogous to the parts of the sacrifice which prefigured it, and we have in the

surrender at the Eucharist the feature which corresponds to that first presentation or offering which virtually included the whole.

I cannot but believe that both the twofold nature of our Lord, God and man, as well as the analogy of those ancient sacrifices which typified His Sacrifice, required that He should express or embody that eternal surrender of Himself as the Lamb, foreordained before the foundation of the world, in a formal surrender of that body of flesh and blood which He had assumed; and if He did not do this at the Last Supper, He must have surrendered it at some other time unknown to us.

But everything seems to point to the time of the Last Supper as the fitting time:—The "dignity of that heavenly Feast;" the time of its institution—that of the Paschal solemnity; the fact that the Lord did then, and not till then, actually speak of His Body as being given, whereas before He said that it *should* be given: "The bread which I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (John vi. 51).

2 The next feature in the Jewish sacrifice was the mactation or slaughter. This part of the typical sacrifice was, of course, fulfilled by the Sufferings and Death endured upon the Cross. This was the actual Sacrifice, because in It the previous self-surrender was completed; in that He had surrendered Himself to be slain. Inasmuch, then, as the atoning work of the Eternal Son was His submission to death, this work was consummated and completed on the Cross.

But be it ever remembered that even this, the all-atoning part of the great redeeming Act, cannot be considered alone. The Sacrifice or Immolation on the Cross derived all its atoning value from that eternal *purpose to suffer* for sin which made the Sufferer to be

the Lamb foreordained; which purpose was, all through the ages, in the divine foreknowledge, (of which the prophetic Scriptures are the witness,*) and which purpose to give Himself for us was ever present in the human mind of the Son of God,† and was certainly most sacrificially set forth at the institution of the Eucharist.

This accords with the teaching of the typical offerings. The lamb, or bullock, or goat, whose blood atoned, was not any lamb, or bullock, or goat, but the one which had been devoted, and brought, and specially offered. So that however men may differ respecting the time or manner of the offering or presentation, they cannot but acknowledge that the Sacrifice of the eternal Son depended upon a previous offering or presentation in intention or purpose.

3. And be it also remembered that the Jewish sacrifice required that the blood shed in the slaughter or

* The most inattentive reader of Scripture cannot help being struck by the frequency with which the apostles appeal to the prophetic Scriptures as exhibiting the foreordination or predestination of the sufferings of Christ. I will cite a few instances: "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" (Acts ii. 23); "Those things, which God before had shewed by the mouth of all His prophets, that Christ should suffer, He hath so fulfilled" (Acts iii. 18); "To do whatsoever Thy Hand and Thy Counsel determined before to be done" (Acts iv. 28); "When they had fulfilled all that was written of Him, they took Him down from the tree" (Acts xiii. 29).

† Thus, Our Lord says, "Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished, for He shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked," &c. (Luke xviii. 31, 32); "As Moses lifted up the serpent," &c. (John iii. 14); "Destroy this temple, and in three days," &c. (John ii. 19); "The Son of Man came . . . to give His Life a ransom for many" (Matth. xx. 28); also John vi., all latter part; also, "I have a Baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished" (Luke xii. 50).

mactation should be presented by the priest by a distinct act of presentation. The slaughter itself was not sufficient. After the slaughter there was, as is natural, an act expressing the purpose for which the creature was slaughtered, viz., to procure atonement. The blood of the victim must be presented and poured forth at the foot of the altar.

In the case of the most solemn of all the offerings, viz., that on the day of atonement, the blood must be brought by the high priest into the Holiest, and there presented, and the very Mercy-seat itself sprinkled with it (Levit. xvi. 14).

Now, the Scriptures assure us that it was needful that the Blood of Christ should be thus presented by Himself in the holiest place of heaven itself. "Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own Blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us" (Heb. ix. 11, 12).

As to the actual reality of all this—the mode and manner of the heavenly Presentation, and sprinkling of the all-atoning Blood—I can say nothing; suffice it to affirm that as the typical sacrificial act was not complete without this presentation and sprinkling of the blood, so it was needful that the Blood shed in the all-atoning Death should be, in some way, presented in heaven by the Great High Priest Himself.

4. The last feature in the typical Sacrifice was the consumption. This consumption was, as I remarked, no part of the actual atoning work, but the sign or seal that the atonement was completed.

The mode of consumption differed in each Sacrifice.

In the Burnt Offering, the whole was burnt, and so supposed to be consumed by God; in other offerings, part was consumed by fire, part by the priests; in the Peace Offerings, part was burnt, part consumed by the priests, part by the people; in the Passover all was consumed by the people.

Now, in this matter of the consumption, the Paschal Lamb is undoubtedly the typical Sacrifice, so far as we are directly concerned; for that thing in the Sacrifice of Christ which corresponds with the entire consumption, by God's fire, of the Burnt Offering, seems to me an unrevealed mystery.*

The Paschal Lamb, I say, is undoubtedly, in this respect, the typical Sacrifice, for St. Paul writes, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast, not with the old leaven," &c. (1 Cor. v. 7). The Lord undoubtedly gave His Body first to be sacrificially slain, and then to be eaten as the antitype of those offerings which, after being slain, were wholly or in part consumed by the worshippers.

Christian men may dispute as to the manner in which the Body of Christ is consumed by the worship-

* Mr. Jukes, in his 'Law of Offerings,' explains it thus: "Here, then, is the first thought presented to us in the burnt-offering: God finds food, that is, satisfaction in the offering. In other sacrifices we have Christ, as the faithful Israelite, by His offering, feeding and satisfying the priests. Here He is seen satisfying Jehovah. The altar is the "Table of the Lord;" whatever was put upon it was "the food of God." The fire from heaven, emblem of God's holiness, consumes the offering; and it all ascends as sweet incense before Him. And just as in the burnt offering, the fire from heaven fell and consumed the Sacrifice of the Altar, a pledge to him who offered it that there was something in the offering which God found pleasure in; so, typically speaking, did God find food in the unblemished Sacrifice of Christ. His perfect spotlessness and devotedness was a sweet feast to the God of heaven" (p. 50).

pers; but the fact that He did give His Body to be this food of sacrifice is certain, if Scripture gives us a true record of His words.

So far for the typical sacrifices and the Great Anti-typical Offering.

And now let us notice some points of contrast which arise out of the fact that these typical sacrifices were but shadows or figures, imperfect in their nature, and transitory in their atoning effect, whereas the Sacrifice of the Lamb of God is all-perfect in its nature and infinite in its atoning power.

There are two special points of contrast.

In the case of the Jewish Sacrifice, because of their imperfect nature and effects, the presentation of the blood was a momentary act, and the consumption of the body in token of acceptance was almost as momentary, and confined to one place, and to a very few persons; whereas in the One Great Atoning Sacrifice, the presentation (whatever it be), as we have shown, must be a continuous act, and the consumption (whatever it be), is by the whole body of believers, in all parts of the world, and to the end of time.

Let us recur again to the Jewish Sacrifice. A man had committed a sin, or contracted an uncleanness. He brought his offering, but it availed only for the particular occasion. The presentation of the blood was not for all his sins or defilements, but for a particular one. He could plead it, or the priest could plead it for him, for only one sin or defilement, and so he could only partake of the sacrifice once, because the reconciliation was temporary, and so the feeding on the body of the victim, which was the sign of peace and reconciliation, was temporary also. Whereas the Death of *the Eternal Son*, being infinite in its atoning value,

has a continuous presentation, and His Sacrificial Body a continuous consumption or manducation by His people.

I trust the reader will forgive me if I resay what I § IX have said before on this point. Its importance seems to demand it. It might be said that because the Sacrifice of the Son of God is infinite in its atoning worth, therefore it needs only a momentary presentation, which took place when, on His Ascension, our High Priest reached the Throne of God. This, I say, *might* have been said, but, if we are to be guided by certain very plain intimations of Scripture, the Wisdom of God has ordered it otherwise. For in the counsels of God the Son of God is to be a "Priest for ever;" as a Priest for ever He must have somewhat ever to offer, or He would not fulfil the one condition of priesthood laid down in the only book of Scripture which treats of His Priesthood.

This offering must be the presentation of His past Sufferings and Death, and because of this He is seen in heaven in all His Glory, as a Lamb standing as slain. If it be said that all this is figurative, we rejoin that, if so, it figures to us (in perhaps the only way in which we can rightly apprehend such a mystery as all-important), the priestly Mediation of Christ through His past Death.

If it be said that we sufficiently account Him a priest, if we look upon Him as One offering our works and our prayers, we rejoin most emphatically, "No." We hope and we believe that He has some better thing to offer besides our miserable works or devotions, and that is the Representation of His own Sacrifice. If it be said that He offers our prayers and praises, "perfumed with the incense of His Merits," we rejoin that

this is a very inadequate figure of speech, used instead of one which far more effectually represents the reality, which is, that He presents His People in Himself, complete in Him, because in that Body of which He stands at the Right Hand of God as the Head.

Having now considered the various parts of the Jewish Sacrifice, and their correspondence with the various stages of the Great Redemptive Work, we are the more able to ascertain the sense in which the Eucharist is, and the sense in which it is not, a Sacrifice.

In any sense in which Christ now offers and presents Himself, or can be offered and presented by His Church, it is a sacrifice or offering, because it is an Offering of Himself on earth in union with the Offering of Himself in heaven.

In any sense in which Christ cannot offer Himself now, it is not a Sacrifice.

Let us take the latter first.

The Atoning Sacrifice, or Offering of the Son of God, was His submission to death, and death can be actually endured by a human being but once, because, by the law of man's being, His natural body can die but once. This is laid down in connection with the Death of Christ by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb. ix. 27, 28).

This atoning Death cannot be offered in the same manner as He offered it on the Cross; because He then offered Himself in the endurance of agony and shame, ending in a Death which, by the law of His human nature, He cannot suffer again; and if He could, He *need not suffer it* again, because the Atonement made

by the Blood which He shed upon the Cross is infinite in value, for that Blood was the "Blood of God."

So that whatever be the reality of the Presentation of His Sacrifice in heaven, it must be the Presentation of a Death long ago endured, and by the endurance of which He made a full and perfect Atonement. He cannot present Himself as actually enduring pains, or as having any further atonement to make.

And as the offering of Himself in heaven is not the present endurance of a sacrificial death, neither is the offering in the Eucharist.

No one, Father or Church Doctor, Roman or Anglican, any more than any Zwinglian, has ever asserted, or even dreamt of asserting, that the Sacrifice in the Eucharist is of such a sort that in it Christ suffers over again His atoning Agony and Death. And yet many respectable Protestant writers, in their zeal against Romish corruptions, seem anxious to fasten this charge, not only upon Romanists, but upon all who hold the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. I give at the end of this treatise (in Appendix C.) a series of extracts from the writings of men of undoubted Catholicity, asserting the all-sufficiency of the Sacrifice on the Cross and the absolute impossibility of Its repetition.

No one, I assert, has ever affirmed that in the Eucharist Christ suffers over again His all-atoning pains of Death; and yet let the reader remember that of that great complex whole, the sacrificial work of Christ, this actual suffering of death is the one thing which is not eternal.

The actual suffering Death of Christ, because it was an all-sufficient Atonement, was temporary: He was held by Death less than three whole days, and equally because this All-Atoning Death was an all-sufficient

Atonement, its Presentation, or most solemn pleading, and its manducation or individual application, is eternal; or, at least, will exist as long as it is rendered necessary by the existence of sin.

If, then, I repeat, the Eucharist be the earthly Representation of that heavenly Presentation now going on at the Right Hand of God—if the highest earthly worship corresponds to the highest heavenly worship—then there is in it no repetition of the Atoning Death, because Christ "dieth no more." But if the Eucharist be the earthly Representation of the heavenly presentation of Himself by Christ now taking place at the Right Hand of God; if the highest earthly worship corresponds to the highest heavenly; then there is in it the sacrificial Presentation of the all-atoning Death, as once for all actually endured, but eternal in its all prevailing power with God. So that there is not so much *a* Sacrifice in the Eucharist, as *the* Sacrifice.

The great Redemptive Work of Jesus Christ is one grand whole, coeval with the sufferance of sin and evil in the world. The God-ordained worship of the human race has ever been the reflex of this great Redemptive Work.

Before Christ came, the Jewish sacrifice set forth the several stages of this great Divine Act. Each sacrifice set forth before God the Eternal Presentation in the Divine Will—the actual shedding of the atoning Blood, the sacrificial Presentation of that Blood itself, and the consumption or participation by each individual in the Atonement.

When the Eternal Son of God came, He offered the *great* Antitypical Sacrifice, which made the slaying of *any meaner life, the* presentation of any meaner blood,

the feeding on any meaner sacrificial body blasphemous and impertinent; but, then, how was His own Sacrifice to be presented, and to be partaken of? He Himself ascended into heaven, there (if we are to believe the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews) to present It in the true Holy of Holies, but how is It to be presented on earth? Is the worship of earth any longer to correspond to that in heaven?

Yes: before His Death Our Great High Priest ordained a means by which His Church, by ever commemorating His Sacrifice, should both present It and partake of It.

So that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, inasmuch as it is the means of presenting, and enabling us to partake of, the One Mactation on the Cross.

Before the precious Death of Christ, there were offered to God, by His own appointment, innumerable sacrifices, each one of these involving its own separate death—the separate presentation of the blood of each, and the separate manducation or partaking of the body of each. The very fact that so many separate lives were destroyed, shewed that no one all-atoning life-blood had been poured forth. But when the All-atoning Blood had been poured forth, all such worship must of necessity cease; but the worship of the Church was not to cease, neither (as the prophets had foretold) was its worship to cease to be sacrificial, but instead of the slaying, and presenting the blood of, and partaking of the bodies of, many sacrifices, it became henceforth the presentation of, and participation of, the *One*.

I know no words which set forth this more clearly than certain words which have been quoted oftener than almost any other, by the Reformers and others, as

making against certain supposed Romish perversions of the Sacrifice in the Eucharist. They are these words of Chrysostom. He is commenting upon that passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews which speaks of Christ having once, in the end of the world, appeared to put away sin by the Sacrifice of Himself, and he (Chrysostom) asks:—

"What, then, do we not offer every day? Certainly we do: but to make a memorial of His Death. And this memorial is one and not many. How can it be one and not many? Because it has been offered once for all (not) like that Sacrifice which was carried into the Holy of Holies. For that Jewish Sacrifice had a relation to that on the Cross, and the Eucharist has a relation to it. For we offer always the same; we do not offer one sheep to-day and another to-morrow; we offer always the same: so that it is one Sacrifice. Otherwise, since the Sacrifice is offered in many places, there must be many Christs. But this is not the case, but there is one Christ everywhere, whole Christ here, and whole Christ there; One Body. As, therefore, He is One Body, though offered in many places, and not many bodies, so, likewise, is there one Sacrifice. It is that High Priest of ours Who has offered the Sacrifice which cleanses us. And we offer even now that Sacrifice which was then, too, offered—the inexhaustible Sacrifice. This happens in memory of that which then took place, for 'do this,' He says, in memory of Me. It is not a different Sacrifice, as the High Priest presented in former times; but we offer always the same; or, rather, we perform a memorial of that Sacrifice."

XI.

THE MEMORIAL SACRIFICE.

THE concluding sentence of the last chapter leads us to consider another matter most essential to the right understanding of this great subject, and this is the memorial aspect of the Eucharist, of What it is a memorial, and to what extent, and how far this memorial feature constitutes it a sacrifice.

Religious writers have drawn from the fact that the Holy Communion is a memorial the most opposite conclusions. We have one set of Divines asserting, or, at least, implying, that because the Eucharist is a memorial it *is* a sacrifice;* and we have another set of Divines asserting that, because it is the memorial of a Sacrifice, it is not itself a sacrifice, because a memorial cannot be the thing of which it is a memorial.

There are some who say that, because the Eucharist is a memorial, it cannot be a sacrifice; but have such persons considered what it was which made the burnt-offerings and sin-offerings of the Jews real sacrifices. It was simply the memorial character of these acts of worship which constituted them sacrifices.

For the Jewish sacrifice was, in itself, divested of the sacred rites which accompanied it, merely the

* Take one as the representation of an host of others. Peter Lombard asserts: "That which is offered and consecrated by the priest is called a sacrifice and oblation, *because* it is the memory and representation of the true Sacrifice and holy Immolation made on the altar of the Cross."

slaughter of an animal fit for food. The slaughter of the creature which was used in the worship of God, and the slaughter of the creature which was used for common food was the same, and the pouring forth of all the blood, so that none of the blood should be eaten, was, in both cases, the same thing.* The difference was in the accompanying rites.

In the one case, that of the religious service, the creature was killed "before the Lord," and its blood poured forth at the bottom of the altar, or sprinkled on the altar or within the vail. In the other case there were none of these rites.

Now, it was not the mere slaughter, but these accompaniments which made the difference between the killing of the creature for food and its sacrifice for atonement; and these accompaniments were all "for memorial." They were memorials of the sin as deserving death, and memorials before God of that gracious purpose or intention of His to atone for sin by a Sacrifice of infinite worth. They were memorials beforehand to call before God His gracious intention to redeem men. At least, we Christians, having the Epistle to the Hebrews as our guide, cannot hold them to be otherwise. So that it was not the slaughter of the creature, but the religious intention to memoralise God by its slaughter, and the accompanying rites which expressed that intention, which constituted the spiritual essence of the sacrifice, and turned one of the commonest acts of daily life into an act of worship.

So that the memorial or commemorative character of the Eucharist instead of being a reason why it should not, is a reason why it should be accounted a sacrifice. It may not be a reason by itself alone, for, of course,

* *Levit.* xvii. 13; Deut. xii. 24.

there may be memorial rites which are not sacrifices, but it is assuredly on the side of its being so accounted.

But this consideration, important though it be, does not go to the root of this great matter. In order to do this we must again distinguish between the various stages of the sacrificial act of Christ.

Our Lord's Redemptive Work is, as I have shown, one great whole, having, at least, four parts or features, each of which was prefigured by some part of the Jewish Sacrifice. 52

There was His Presentation or Offering of Himself, in purpose, ages before the actual sacrifice, and this seems absolutely essential to the efficacy of His Sacrifice. There was the actual mactation, or immolation, or slaying on the Cross; there was the Presentation in heaven of the accomplished Sacrifice; and there was the feeding on the Sacrificial Body.

With respect to the first of these, the Eucharist is commemorative, for in heaven He does not offer Himself to be actually crucified afresh; neither can we on earth think of in suchwise offering Him.

With respect to the immolation or mactation, the Eucharist is commemorative, for He does not now offer Himself as actually now suffering the pains of death which He suffered upon the Cross; and so the Eucharist is the anamnesis or memory of these sufferings endured once for all; and so we say in our Prayer of Consecration: "Who made there (by His One Oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in His Holy Gospel commanded us to continue, a perpetual memory of that His precious Death until His coming again," * &c.

* And so all Liturgies:—

The Clementine: "Calling, therefore, to remembrance those things

But with respect to the representation of His Death which He is now making at the Right Hand of God, it is clear that, if the Eucharist has any relation to this, it cannot be by way of what is commonly understood by "memorial;" for memory relates to what is past, whereas the perpetual exercise of His everlasting Priesthood is now going on; for He is now representing and pleading His All-atoning Death. The Eucharist, if it corresponds at all to this form of the present Intercession of our Lord, must be a Re-presentation of It, or a Reproduction under earthly, but still Divinely ordained forms, of what is now going on in heaven under heavenly forms.

And this is what we hold it to be. Nothing less than

---

which He endured for our sakes, we give thanks to Thee, O Almighty God, not as we ought, but as we are able, and fulfil His Institution. For in the same night in which He was betrayed, &c. Wherefore having in remembrance His Passion, Death, and Resurrection from the dead," &c.

St. James: "Wherefore having in remembrance His Life-giving Passion, Salutary Cross, Death, Burial, and Resurrection on the Third Day from the Dead; His Ascension into Heaven and sitting at the Right Hand of Thee His Father, and His second bright and terrible Advent, we sinners offer to Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice, beseeching Thee not to deal with us," &c.

St. Mark: "Showing forth, therefore, O Lord Almighty, Heavenly King, the Death of Thine Only Begotten Son our Lord, our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and confessing His blessed Resurrection from the dead on the third day," &c.

St. Chrysostom: "In remembrance, therefore, of this command of our Saviour, and all those things which he did endure for us, His Cross, His Burial, His Resurrection on the third day," &c.

Roman Liturgy or Mass: "Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation, which we make to Thee in memory of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ." "Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants, as also Thy whole people, calling to mind the blessed Passion *of the same Christ* Thy Son our Lord, His Resurrection from Hell and *glorious Ascension into* Heaven, offer unto Thy most excellent Majesty *of Thy gifts and grants* a pure Host," &c.

this will account for the place which it has ever held in the Christian worship, and nothing but holding this will prevent us from regarding it as an independent sacrifice.

And as regards the consumption of the sacrifice by the worshippers, it is clear that the Eucharist is not the memorial of what is past, but the participation of what must be, in some heavenly and spiritual way, then and there present. Christ has given to us in this Sacrament a means of perpetually feeding upon His Flesh and Blood sacrificially slain. So that while we commemorate His past atoning Death, we join ourselves with His Presentation of Himself now going on in heaven; and we feed on the Body and Blood of His Sacrifice mysteriously present, and by so doing unite ourselves to Him and to one another, according to the words of His apostle: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ? for we, being many, are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread" (1 Cor. x. 16, 17).

And now we shall have to draw attention to the force of these words, "memory," or "memorial," or "remembrance," or "commemoration," by which we signify the relation of the Eucharist to the actual Death of Christ on the Cross.

The Death of Christ, though it was actually endured in its pain and horror at one past moment in the world's history, is yet set forth in Scripture under images which seem to invest it with the attribute of Eternity.

When He is said to be "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," His Death is affirmed to exist, in power and efficacy, in the ages before He suffered,

and when now, on the throne of the unseen and eternal world, He presents Himself "a Lamb standing as slain," there is a mingling of the figures of death and life of which all human language must fail to express the reality. Such words as "memorial" or "memory" or "commemoration" fail, palpably fail, to set forth the nature and limits of such an anamnesis. The figure, if it be lawful to call it a figure, teaches us that the Death, once endured in weakness, exists in grace and power. Let a man but devoutly and believingly consider this "vision of God" and he will be forced to confess that such a word as "memorial" is much too cold and too weak to describe such a presentation or living exhibition of past sufferings. We have no word for it, nor can we have, for both the Death and the Presentation of the Death partake of the inconceivable mystery of the Being of Him Who is both God and Man in One Person; for it is One Person Who, being man, was born in time, and lived for so many years, and died at a definite moment, and yet so inhabits eternity that He could say, "Before Abraham was, I am," and to His apostles, "Lo, I am with you alway." It was the union of the temporal and eternal in Christ which enabled Him to be "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," and it is this union which gives Him the power to mediate through His Death as if It is now present on the throne of God.

So far for the showing forth of His Death in heaven. And He has commanded us to show It forth on earth, and by no ordinary rite, but by one which He ordained on the eve of His own Sacrifice, and in such evident connection with it that He called the bread His Body which is given, and, of course, given in sacrifice, and the *wine His Blood* which is shed, and shed in sacrifice.

Now, if this be the Representation of His heavenly Presentation of Himself, we must be careful how we understand such words as "memory" or "memorial" in connection with it. It is the memory of a Death suffered once for all, but it is the memory of a Death which, though past in the matter of pain and suffering, is yet all powerful in its efficacy and grace. Whilst we use such words as "memory" or "memorial" to set forth that His Sufferings are past and His atoning Work all-sufficient, and that "being raised from the dead He dieth no more," yet we shall make a wretched use of these words if we use them so as to exclude from the Eucharist its function of representing on earth that Almighty Pleading of His Death which He Himself is carrying on now in heaven under a form which makes the very Death present. For the Holy Mystery which we celebrate upon earth is evidently intended by Him to furnish His Church with the liveliest possible representation of His Death; for it is the mystery of a Body and its Blood not united in life, but separated in death; for our Lord Himself ordained His Sacrament in a two-fold consecration. He first ordained that we should say: "This is My Body which is broken," or given, i.e., in death; and then, "This is My Blood which is shed" —shed in and by the death by which His Body is given. So that the Lamb, once for all slain upon the Cross, and now in heaven, "standing as slain," is set forth and represented as slain in our Sacraments.

It is their realisation of this which makes the Fathers so continually speak of an immolation in the Sacrament —meaning an immolation in mystery or representation, and never for a moment supposing that Christ actually dies again His All-atoning Death. Thus Chrysostom: "When thou seest the Lord sacrificed and lying (on the

altar), and the priest standing and praying over the sacrifice, and all reddened with that precious Blood, thinkest thou that thou art yet amongst men, and standest upon the earth? or dost thou not straightway remove to heaven, and casting forth from thy soul every carnal thought, with bared soul and pure mind survey the things in heaven" (De Sacerdot. iii. 4). Now, this is not rhetoric. It is simply the natural outcome of a thorough realisation of the living power with which the Death of Christ is set forth before God in the Eucharist. It may be paralleled, indeed it is rather exceeded by the language used by such a writer as John Wesley, in several of his hymns on the Eucharist, as for instance:

"With solemn faith we offer up
And spread before Thy Glorious Eyes
That only ground of all our hope,
That precious Bleeding Sacrifice,
Which brings Thy Grace on sinners down,
And perfects all our souls in one.

"Father, behold Thy dying Son,
And hear His Blood that speaks above,
On us let all Thy Grace be shown,
Peace, righteousness, and joy, and love.
Thy kingdom come to every heart
And all Thou hast, and all Thou art."

And again—

"By faith we see Thy Sufferings past
In this mysterious rite brought back,
And on Thy grand Oblation cast
Its saving benefit partake.
Memorial of Thy Sacrifice,
This Eucharistic Mystery,
The full atoning Grace supplies,
And sanctifies our gifts in Thee."

And the truth and reality of this offering of Christ *in mystery* was acknowledged by no other than Bishop

Ridley, in his disputation at Oxford in 1555, the year of his "martyrdom:"—

Q. "What say you to that council, wnere it is said that the priest doth offer an unbloody sacrifice of Christ?"

Ridley. "I say it is well said, if it be rightly understood."

Q. "But he offereth an unbloody sacrifice?"

Ridley. "It is called unbloody, and is offered after a certain manner, *and in a mystery*, and a representation of that Bloody Sacrifice; and he doth not lie who saith Christ to be (so) offered."—Ridley's Works, Parker Society, p. 250.*

---

* The following are examples of great Christian writers acknowledging this mystical immolation:—

St. Ambrose: "But now hath the shade of night and the darkness of the Jews departed; the day of the Church hath drawn nigh. We have seen the High Priest coming to us, we have seen and heard Him offering for us His Blood; we priests follow as we can, that we may offer sacrifice for the people; although weak in deserts, yet honourable in sacrifice; since though Christ is not now seen to offer, yet Himself is offered upon earth when the Body of Christ is offered: yea, Himself is plainly seen to offer in us, whose Word sanctifieth the sacrifice which is offered, and Himself indeed standeth by us as an Advocate with the Father; but now we see Him not: then shall we see Him when the image shall have passed away."—In Psa. xxxviii. s. 25.

Again, "The shadow in the Law, the image in the Gospel, Truth in the heavenly places. Before, a Lamb was offered; a calf, too, was offered; now Christ is offered. But He is offered as a man, as capable of suffering; and He offers Himself as a Priest to forgive our sins; here in image, there in truth, where He intercedeth for us as an Advocate with the Father."—Ambrose de Off. i. 48, s. 248.

Augustine: "Was not Christ sacrificed once in His own Person, and yet in the sacrament is sacrificed for the people, not only through all the festivals of Easter, but every day? and it is clear that He does not speak falsely who, being asked, shall answer that He is sacrificed."—Ep. 98, Ad Bonifacium, s. 9.

Mede: "What time so fit and reasonable to commend our devotions unto God as when the Lamb of God is slain upon the Holy Table, and we receive visibly, though mystically, those gracious pledges of His Blessed Body and Blood."—From 'The Christian Sacrifice.'

Jeremy Taylor: "The eternal sacrifice of the Lamb slain from the

Such, then, is the relation of the Eucharist to the Sacrificial Death upon the Cross. A memorial, and more than a memorial, as men commonly understand the word; and yet all Catholic writers speak of it as a memorial or commemorative sacrifice, because, however mysteriously real the Re-presentation of the Death of Christ, yet that Death could be actually suffered but once. He doth not offer Himself often after the manner of His offering upon the Cross. "Once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." "We are sanctified through the offering of the Body of Christ once for all."

Now it appears to me that amongst true Christians who desire to enter into the mind of Christ in instituting this Sacrament, there can be no mutual understanding till those who write or preach on the sacrificial side fully explain and put forward the sense in which all Fathers, school-men, and all modern Catholic writers, Popish or Protestant, speak of the Eucharist as a memorial or commemorative sacrifice: —

And on the other hand, till writers on the anti-sacri-

---

beginning of the world being always the same, it bleeds no more after the finishing of it on the Cross; but it is wonderfully represented in heaven, and graciously represented here—by Christ's action there, by His commandment here. And the event of it is plainly this, that as Christ, in virtue of His Sacrifice on the Cross, intercedes for us with His Father, so does the minister of Christ's Priesthood here; that the virtue of the Eternal Sacrifice may be salutary and effectual to all the needs of the Church, both for things temporal and eternal. And, therefore, it was not without great mystery and clear significance that our Blessed Lord was pleased to command the representation of His Death and Sacrifice on the Cross should be made by breaking bread and effusion of wine to signify to us the nature and sacredness of the Liturgy we are about, and that we minister in the Priesthood of Christ, Who is *a Priest for* ever after the order of Melchizedec."—'Worthy Communicant,' *chap. i. s. 4.*

ficial side seriously consider before Whom, or to Whom, by their own act and deed, they make the memorial.

All Christian writers, from the earliest Fathers to the present time, speak of it as a memorial, or commemorative sacrifice.

Justin Martyr says: "The Eucharist, the celebration of which our Lord Jesus Christ prescribed, in remembrance of the suffering which He endured on behalf of those who are purified in soul from all iniquity."—Dial. with Trypho, ch. xli.

Cyprian: "As often as we drink, we do in remembrance of the Lord the same thing which the Lord also did."—Epistle to Cæcilius, sec. 11.

Augustine: "That alone we call (the body of Christ) which, taken of the fruits of the earth, and consecrated with the Mystic Prayer, we receive solemnly, to the salvation of our souls, in memory of our Lord's Passion for us."—De Trin. iii. 4, s. 10.

Chrysostom: "What then do we not offer every day? Certainly we do; but to make a memorial of His Death."—On Epistle to Hebrews, Hom. xvii. 3.

p. 74

Mediæval writers and Romanists—

Peter Lombard (before quoted): "That which is offered and consecrated by the Priest is called a sacrifice and oblation, because it is the memory and representation of the true Sacrifice."

p. 75,

Thomas Aquinas: "'Do this in remembrance of Me.' The first cause of the institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Body is the memory of the Saviour."—'Sacrament of the Altar.' Translated by Neale and another, p. 9.

Council of Trent: "He, therefore, our Lord and God, though He was about to offer Himself once on the Altar of the Cross unto God the Father, by means of His Death, there to work an eternal Redemption; nevertheless because that His Priesthood was not to be extinguished by His Death, in the last supper on the night on which He was betrayed, that He might leave to His own Spouse, the Church, a visible sacrifice such as the nature of man requires, whereby that Bloody Sacrifice once for all to be accomplished on the Cross might be represented, and the memory thereof remain unto the end of the world," &c.—Sess. xxii. ch. 3.

Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester: "This is agreed, and by the Scriptures plainly taught, that the Oblation and Sacrifice of our Saviour Christ was and is a perfect work, once consummate in perfection

without the necessity of reiteration, as it was never taught to be reiterated, but a mere blasphemy to presuppose it. It is also in the Catholic teaching, grounded upon the Scripture, agreed that the same Sacrifice once consummate was ordained by Christ's institution in His most Holy Supper to be in the Church often remembered and showed forth," &c.—Quoted in Archbishop Cranmer's Writings on the Lord's Supper. Parker Society, p. 344.

Cornelius a Lapide: "The ancient sacrifices were true sacrifices, although they represented the Sacrifice on the Cross. In like manner the Eucharist is a true sacrifice, although it be done in commemoration of the Sacrifice on the Cross."—On 1 Cor. xi. 24.

Bishop Challoner's 'Garden of the Soul:' "He also instituted the Blessed Eucharist . . . . to be offered and presented by His ministers to His Father (mystically broken and shed) as a sacrifice, not by way of a new death, but by way of a standing memorial of His Death."

Döllinger: "The sacrificial rite of the earthly Church represents and typifies that act of love of which it is the appointed memorial."—'First Age of the Church.'

Prayer Book of the Church of England—

"Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained? For the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ."

"He hath instituted and ordained Holy Mysteries as pledges of His love, and for a continual remembrance of His Death."

"Did institute, and in His Holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that His Precious Death. . . . . Grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's Holy Institution, in remembrance of His Death and Passion," &c.

Of Anglican writers on the Catholic side four will suffice—

Bishop Andrews: "They (of our side) believe that the Eucharist was instituted by our Lord for the commemoration of Him; even of His Sacrifice, or, if we may so speak, for a commemorative Sacrifice, and not only for a Sacrament."—'Responsio ad Apologiam.'

Bishop Jeremy Taylor: "As it is a commemoration and representment of Christ's Death; so it is a commemorative sacrifice."—'Life of Christ.' Disc. xix.

Dr. Neale: "What are the principal differences between the Sacri*fice of the Holy* Eucharist now and that of our Lord upon the Cross? *The One real and the Other* only commemorative. The One meri-

torious in itself, the Other deriving its merit from the First. The One of our Lord's mortal and passible Body, the other of His immortal Body."—'Catechetical Notes,' p. 131.

Mr. Keble: "It (the Eucharist) has two purposes. 1. To be a continual remembrance, or memory, or memorial, before God as well as man, not a repetition or continuance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ. 2. To be verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful for the strengthening," &c.—'Eucharistical Adoration,' p. 75. Third Edition.

I have given these testimonies to the Commemorative Sacrifice from writers of all ages and schools of thought holding Catholic truth for this purpose. There are those amongst us who speak of the identity of the Sacrifice in the Eucharist with that upon the Cross after such a fashion as seemingly to exclude from the Eucharist all its memorial or commemorative character, which is, in fact, tantamount to denying it to be a Eucharist, for Eucharist is thanksgiving, and if we thank God in or by the Eucharist for anything, we thank Him for "the redemption of the world by the Death and Passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and Man." They assert that the Eucharist is the same Sacrifice as that offered up upon the Cross, because the Priest is the same, and the Victim is the same, for the Priest in every Eucharist is the Great High Priest, present though invisible, and the victim is His Body and Blood.

But such persons speak as if they mistook the whole nature of the Sacrifice on the Cross. They speak as if the Eternal God demanded as an atonement for moral evil so much body here and so much blood there—flesh and blood physically separated, and no more; whereas the whole power and spirit of the All-atoning Sacrifice lay in the submission, the obedience, the offering, the sacrifice of the Will: the Body and Blood separated in

death were but the outward visible sign of a submission of will unparalleled in the universe, and so we read: Heb. x. 10 "By which WILL we are sanctified through the offering of the Body of Christ once for all." Now what was the reality of this submission of Will of which the outward manifestation was this Sacrifice of the Body of Christ? It was His submission to the Will of God, so that He should willingly endure the extremity of shame and pain. The Most Glorious of beings voluntarily endured the vilest of deaths; the Fountain of all Justice was condemned by an unjust judgment; the Giver of the Law received a sentence pronounced in mockery of all law. The most loving of friends was betrayed by one friend, denied by another, deserted by all. The Institutor of the one only God-ordained religion was rejected by the heads of that religion. The most painful tortures were inflicted on Him Who had spent His life in relieving pain; and, above all, the Sinless One had the sins of men so imputed to Him that it could be truly said, 2 Cor. v. 21 "He Who knew no sin was made sin for us." The prospect of all this wrung from Him His Bloody Sweat. The endurance of it wrung from Him His almost despairing cry, "My God! my God! why hast Thou forsaken Me?"

Such was the Atoning Sacrifice—such the mactation or immolation of the Victim. And yet we have men glibly saying, "The Sacrifice in the Eucharist and on the Cross is the same except the mactation!" Or it is said to be the same sacrifice only offered in different ways. But let the reader for a moment try to realise the difference between the ways. Let him set before himself the least of the atoning Sufferings, and then talk, if he can, *without explanation*, of the Sacrifice being the same.

And yet there is a sense in which the Sacrifice on the Cross and in the Eucharist is the same, and unless we realise this we cannot realise the Institution.

Now we have shown that the Jewish Sacrifice was a compound thing, and of such a sort that each one of its four parts could be often, and with truth, taken for the whole, so as to be called the Sacrifice.

The first presentation at the door of the tabernacle was, so far as the offerer was concerned, the sacrifice, for when he had so offered it, he had done his part. As far as it depended upon him, it was already immolated, its blood presented, and its body consumed. The mactation was, of course, in the most peculiar or proper sense, the sacrifice.

But the presentation of the blood could also be truly called the sacrifice, because it was the one thing which gave to the whole act its religious character. It transformed the mere slaughter of a lamb or goat into a solemn act of worship. Without this offering or presenting of the blood, it was not a Sacrifice TO GOD; and so, of course, this presenting of the blood included, so to speak, the previous death of the victim, and was the sacrifice.

Now what is true of the Jewish Sacrifice is far more true of the Sacrifice of Christ. It has its parts or stages, any one of which, in a most profound mystery, can be taken to include the whole. For the Sacrifice of Christ is the inconceivable mystery of One and the same Person existing in eternity, and yet living and dying in time.

Now because of this, His Presentation of Himself before He suffered (whether in the eternal ages, or at the Last Supper matters not), was the presentation of One to Whose Foreknowledge all His Sufferings were present.

They were present in all their magnitude and in all their minuteness in His Mind. Every indignity, every pang, every distress, were realised by Him as an eternal being only can realise what must take place; and the proof is that the very details of His Sufferings were recounted beforehand in prophecy. Wherefore His Eternal Presentation of Himself was His Sacrifice, so that He should be in very deed the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. When a human being offers himself in any way of sacrifice, however perfect his intention, a thousand things may intervene to frustrate that intention, but when the Eternal Son offered Himself, nothing could intervene either to arrest the sacrifice, or to mitigate one pain, for it was all "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God;" so that when He offered Himself before His Incarnation, His Immolation was as certain as His Existence. So that when we say that, before He actually suffered, He offered Himself "in mystery," we must not for a moment think that such "mystery" means "figure" or "type." No. There is a tremendous reality in it that no finite being, that is, no being who has not the future perfectly present in his mind, can do more than feel after.

And as it was with the Presentation of His Sacrifice beforehand, so it is with the Presentation of His Sacrifice now.

As His Sufferings were perfect in His foreknowledge, so now do they exist perfectly in His mind or memory. So that this presentation of His Passion is far beyond the outward exhibition of the marks of suffering yet retained on the glorified body of the "Lamb standing as slain." His atoning pains, yet perfectly present in the mind of His Unchangeable Godhead, are by Him *set forth before* the mind of His Father just as

vividly as the outward signs of them are now set forth before the hosts of heaven.

And so when He offers Himself as the Lamb slain the mystery is not a figure, but a Divine Reality, but being unspeakable we call it a mystery. If the death of the Jewish victim existed and was included under the presentation of its blood, much more does the Death of the All-atoning Victim exist in the presentation now going on on the throne of God.

Now the Eucharist is the counterpart on earth of this mysterious presentation in heaven, because our Lord 22
ordained it in words, and by an action, and at a time which identified it with His Sacrifice.

When at that Passover time He brake the bread and said, "This is my Body," He both mysteriously and sacramentally identified the bread with the Body of the Sacrifice, and He also said and did that which necessitated His Sacrifice on the Cross the next day, and so in His Divine intention He included His own Sacrifice in the Eucharistic action.

But when He ordained the Eucharist He ordained it to be a perpetual memory of His Death on earth, and He was Himself about to make a perpetual memory of That Death in heaven, so that, as seems natural, the highest earthly worship should correspond to the highest heavenly, which it must do, unless His Incarnation and Death has separated earth from heaven rather than united them.

But we cannot entertain such a thought for a moment, and so we believe that the earthly is identical with the heavenly Presentation, performed by the same Omnipresent Priest, and including under earthly forms all that is included in the heavenly Presentation, and so it includes, and in an unspeakable mystery makes

present, and presents, the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ.

And so this rite is *not*, and yet *is*, identical with the Sacrifice on the Cross. It is the memorial of the bitter Pains and Death, and so cannot be the actual endurance of those Pains and that Death; and yet it is more than a memorial, for, unlike any mere human memorial, it includes and presents the Atoning Death, and so in an unspeakable mystery is the Sacrifice.

The truth and yet the difficulty of this mystery appears to me to be well set forth in the following extract:—

"This act of Consecration, which passes on the bread and wine separately, represents and commemorates the Bloody Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross. In this double Consecration, so to call it, consists the essence of the Sacrifice; as the essence of that Bloody Sacrifice on the Cross consisted in the actual separation of our Lord's All-atoning Blood from His Sacred Body, terminating in a real death. This is properly the commemorative act, by which we "show the Lord's Death" and keep up that "perpetual memory which He hath instituted, and in His Holy Gospel commanded us to continue till His coming again." But in the Eucharist there is no real death; the Victim is not actually slain, and therefore it may be said there is no real Sacrifice. And if the term sacrifice necessarily involved the idea of the extinction of life or shedding of blood, it would be true; but it is with no such idea that ecclesiastical writers use the word. They universally employ it as equivalent to the more general term offering, in the sense of something presented to God to propitiate His Favour, and to obtain benefits from Him. The very designation of 'bloodless or unbloody sacrifice,' which so frequently occurs in reference to the Eucharist, excludes all thought but that of a commemoration of Christ's Bloody Sacrifice upon the Cross. Yet so close is the relation of the one to the other, and so much is the Eucharist regarded in this point of view as a representative act, showing forth the Lord's Death by the separate consecration of the bread and wine, that the language peculiar to the actual fact—the shedding of the Victim's Blood—is used by ancient writers as commonly as the mention of the Eucharist itself, and Christ is said to be sacrificed, *immolated*, slain upon the altar, and lying there while the Priest *stands over the Sacrifice* and prays."—'Tracts for the Day,' No. 5.

Note on Chapter XI.

The Eucharist cannot be accounted to be the same Sacrifice as that of the Cross simply and merely on the ground that its Inward Part is the Body and Blood of Christ. This is allowed by all Roman Catholic writers who permit themselves to face the fact that a sacrifice is not a victim, but an action performed on a victim. Such writers are obliged to allow that, so far as the endurance of the One All-atoning Death is concerned, the disunited Body and Blood are symbolical.

Döllinger, whilst yet in union with Rome, writes: "How, indeed, could the celebration of that Sacrificial Death, wherein He Who died and is now glorified is Himself present, be anything else but a Sacrifice in which the Lord's Body is held up before the Father in Heaven, as an offering of atonement and thanksgiving, under the symbols of His Passion and outpoured Blood, given and received in Communion as a token of peace and reconciliation?"

Again, "No new immolation takes place; only that once made on Calvary is exhibited to the Christian people in a symbolic act, sensibly representing the separation of body and blood in death."—'First Age of the Church,' ch. iii.

But the reader will find this distinction drawn out most clearly in a Catechism by the Rev. Joseph Deharbe, S.J., and translated (*permissu Superiorum*, the imprimatur being that of Cardinal Wiseman) by the Rev. J. Fander. I take the liberty of transcribing the whole which relates to the matter in hand:

"Why is the Sacrifice of the Mass the same Sacrifice as that of the Cross?—Because in both it is the same Who offers, and who is offered, namely, Jesus Christ our Lord.

"How is the manner of offering different in both?—On the Cross Christ offered Himself in a bloody manner; but in the Mass He offers Himself in an unbloody manner, whilst He renews the Sacrifice accomplished on the Cross, without suffering or dying any more.

"If Christ dies no more, how then can the Sacrifice which He consummated on the Cross be renewed in the Mass?—It is renewed, because in the Mass Christ offers Himself really and truly, under the emblems of the bloody Death which He suffered on the Cross, that is, under the separated appearances of bread and wine.

"By virtue of the words which the Priest pronounces, the Body of Christ becomes present under the appearance of bread, and His Blood under the

appearance of wine; and both these appearances being visibly *separated* from each other [the separation of the blood from the body], consequently the bloody Death on the Cross is represented in an unbloody mystical manner. This unbloody renewal is, however, not made in order that we may be redeemed anew, for the Sacrifice of the Cross was sufficient for the Redemption of the whole world, but that we may have a standing memorial and a lively, though unbloody, representation of the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross, by which God is perfectly honoured, and the abundant fruits of the Redemption are applied to our souls."—From 'A full Catechism of the Catholic Religion,' p. 266.

XII.

THE MEMORIAL ASPECT OF THE EUCHARIST CONSIDERED.

Some further observations will be required in order to set in as clear a light as possible this memorial character of the Eucharist, for some confusion exists respecting the right understanding of the words "memory," or "memorial," or "remembrance."

Take the word "memory." By lexicographers it is defined as signifying an internal act of the mind, as the power of retaining and recalling things past; and some Christian writers, who have an unaccountable predilection for giving the lowest and most commonplace meaning possible to the words of the God-Man, seem content with this view; but it is clear that in that prayer with which we have most to do in this matter of the Eucharist, i.e., in the Prayer of Consecration, the word "memory" is used in a much higher sense, for we there recount before God that "Our Lord Jesus Christ did institute, and in His Holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that His Precious Death." The word "memory" here betokens far more than a mere act of the mind, for respecting such a thing it never could be said that Christ "instituted" it.

He instituted an outward visible act of remembrance, memorial, commemoration, or (to use His own word) anamnesis.

Now, in considering the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the question meets us at every turn, not merely "of What," but "to Whom," or "before Whom" is the memorial to be made? for we may make it—

1. Before God;
2. Before men; or
3. To ourselves.

1. If the memorial be made "before God," then the Eucharist must be the most solemn pleading possible before God of the Merits of the Death of Christ; and inasmuch as it is the one rite ordained by Christ for the Representation of His Death, it must, if performed aright, and in a right spirit, be the most effectual means of representing and pleading His Sacrifice.

2. If the memorial be "before men," it must be as a profession of our faith in Christ, in which case it is not so much a memorial, or setting forth of Christ, as of something in ourselves, our own faith or experience.

3. If the memorial be "to ourselves," then the Holy Communion is an ordinance of preaching or teaching.

Now, before examining the evidence for each of these ways of regarding the memorial, I would draw especial attention to the fact that our whole conception of the Eucharist as an act of worship depends upon our admitting, or altogether excluding, the first of these three, namely, that it is a memorial "before God." For the conception of it as a memorial before God must, by its very nature, be so infinitely greater than the conception of it as a memorial before our brethren, or to ourselves, that if we hold it at all, we must hold it to be the first and great design of the Eucharist considered as a memorial.

As God is greater than man, so must a memorial in *His Sight, and* with a view to His Approval and the

calling down of His Grace, be greater than a thing done to remind our brethren or ourselves.

So that if we hold it to be primarily a means of reminding ourselves, we cannot hold it to be a sacrifice, even in the sense of a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. It cannot be a sacrifice, even in the limited and subordinate sense in which a verbal prayer or verbal act of praise is a sacrifice.

But if we hold it to be primarily a memorial before God, we are also at liberty to hold it to be in a subordinate, but yet important, sense a memorial before our brethren, because it is a solemn act of faith in our Redeemer's Sacrifice which we make before our brethren: we should not do it at all unless we believed that Christ was the Son of God, and that He has redeemed us by His Death; and we can also hold it to be, in an important sense, a memorial to ourselves, because we cannot draw near with faith without gratefully calling to mind the Death and Passion of our Saviour Christ, and so having the sense of it more deeply imprinted in our minds and hearts.

And now, before seeing what we are taught by Scripture and by the Church on this matter, let us put, side by side, the two views: the first, that the Eucharist is a memorial before God; the second, that it is a memorial to ourselves, so that we can have a clear view of what is meant by each.

The first shall be in the words of Mede, in his work on 'The Christian Sacrifice':—

"By this sacred rite of bread and wine we present and inculcate His Blessed Passion to His Father; we put Him in mind thereof, by setting the monuments thereof before Him; we testify our own mindfulness thereof unto His Sacred Majesty; that so He would for His sake, according to the tenor of His covenant, in Him be favourable and propitious to us miserable sinners."

The second may be well expressed in the words of a popular tract-writer of the day:—

"The bread which in the Lord's Supper is broken, given, and eaten is meant to remind *us* of Christ's Body given on the Cross for our sins. The wine which is poured out and received is meant to remind us of Christ's Blood shed on the Cross for our sins. He that eats that bread and drinks that wine is reminded in the most striking and forcible manner of the benefits Christ has obtained for his soul."*

I select these two extracts to put them side by side, because they are both taken from writers of very strong anti-Romish tendencies. No writer can be more ultra-Protestant than Mede in his views of the Book of the Revelations as setting forth the Romish apostacy.

Which, then, of these views represents the truth of God?

Now, if we take the word "anamnesis," which our Lord used for memorial in His institution of the Eucharist, and explain it by its use in the one only place where it occurs in the rest of the New Testament (i.e. in Hebrews x. 3), then the anamnesis which He commanded must be made wholly and solely before God, for it is employed to denote the anamnesis or remembrance of sins made by the Jewish High Priest on the great Day of Atonement; and this anamnesis was so wholly and peculiarly "before God," that no man was to be in the Tabernacle when the High Priest made it (Levit. xvi. 17).

So that, if we are to be guided by the signification of the word which Christ used, the memorial is emphatically "before God."

But there is a word used by St. Paul to denote the setting forth of Christ in the Holy Communion, which is the word καταγγέλετε, translated "ye do shew" [the

* *Rev.* J. C. Ryle, 'Why and Why Not?' p. 5.

Lord's Death till He come]; and to ascertain the scope of this word also we must be guided by what is said in other places respecting the design of Holy Communion, as to whether we are to understand this "shewing" to be "before God," or "before men," or "before both."

That St. Paul means that it is the design of this ordinance to preach Christ is simply incredible, for this reason—that the proclaiming of the Death of Christ in such an ordinance is exceedingly indirect, the ordinance itself requiring to be explained and preached about before it can be understood in the least degree. If a heathen man were to come into a Christian assembly, and see the Holy Communion celebrated, he would not in the least understand what it meant; a picture or a crucifix would far more clearly set forth before a man in such a state of mind the Sufferings of Christ; whereas there is an ordinance in Christianity (and in one respect its most characteristic ordinance) which directly proclaims to all men the salvation of Christ; and that is the ordinance of preaching.

Again, I would remark, that if proclaiming or preaching Christ's Death to men be the principal meaning of this shewing forth, then we of the Church of England (at least those of us who believe such a thing) are the most inconsistent people in the world, for we profess to believe that the Lord's Supper is simply an ordinance for proclaiming the Death of Christ, and we proceed to celebrate it with closed doors, to a comparatively small number of people, all of whom are supposed to have already received in their hearts the Gospel of Christ, and so profited by it as to desire further grace from Him; and we rigorously exclude the presence of those who most require the Death of Christ to be proclaimed to them. The Romanists are vastly more con-

sistent. In their basilicas and vast cathedrals they celebrate the Sacrament of His Passion before all the world, and hold up the sacramental Sign to multitudes filling spaces far beyond the reach of the voice of the preacher. And it is this which makes Romish controversial writers assert a memorial before men as distinctly and strongly as any Protestant writers can do;* for instance, Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester writes:—

"It is also in the Catholic teaching, grounded upon the Scriptures, agreed that the same Sacrifice, once consummate, was ordained by Christ's institution in His Most Holy Supper to be in the Church often remembered and shewed forth in such sort of shewing as to the faithful is seen present the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ under the forms of bread and wine."—Quoted in 'Works of Cranmer on the Lord's Supper' (Parker Society), p. 344.

I do not, of course, vindicate all this; but if this Sacrament be chiefly a proclamation "before men," then, like the kindred ordinance of preaching, it should be addressed to all; but if it be a means of setting forth Christ's Death before His Father by way of sacrificial pleading, then those only can take part in such a celebration who, by a living faith in Him, are empowered to plead His Death on their behalf.

And now I will consider the testimony of the Church to the fact that it is a memorial before God.

This testimony is of such a sort that it compels those who, out of the Church, deny that the Eucharist is a memorial, or representation, before God, to confess it within the Church to be made before God, and not only to confess, but actually in word and deed themselves to make the memorial before God. For every branch of

* *In fact more* strongly than such Protestant writers as Bishop *Andrews, Mede,* and Johnson.

the Church in every age has directed that the recital of our Lord's Sufferings and Death, as well as of the words in which He instituted the memorial of it, should form part of a prayer to God the Father.

Thus, to take our own Prayer of Consecration, every minister who uses it makes the memorial before God by first of all devoutly recalling to the Mind of God that He gave His only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our Redemption; then he recalls to the same Divine Mind the blessed effect of these Sufferings in a "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world;" then he proceeds to recount before God the circumstances of the institution of the Sacrament; and during the recital of this, and in the course of the same prayer—for it is all in the form of prayer to God—he performs the same manual acts, and accompanies them with the same words as the Son of God Himself did on the night of His betrayal.

And to crown all, the assembled worshippers join in this memorial before God, as well as in the acts and words which are embodied in it, by a very solemn "Amen;"* thereby taking their part in, and claiming as their own, this commemoration, or setting forth before God, just as they take their part in, and claim as their own, all other prayers which they offer and present to the Majesty on High.

And here we cannot help adoring the good Providence of God in His so ordering matters in this our branch of the Church, that those of her children who regard the

* If the reader refers back to my note in page 11 of this treatise he will see the importance attached from the earliest times to this "Amen," as expressing the unfeigned assent and consent of the whole Church to the action of the celebrant.

Eucharist as a Memorial Sacrifice cannot be deprived of it by the will of the individual minister, for if he adheres with anything like faithfulness to the rules furnished to him, he must do all that is absolutely needful to make the sacrificial memorial before God.

For the memorial, or sacrificial act, does not consist in the practice of the things in which men (in our Church at least) differ in their mode of celebrating, but in that in which all who use our service must agree. For it consists in the doing of what Christ commanded to be done, and the saying after Him of what He said. As Mr. Keble has well put it:—

"This is the proper drift of the word 'remembrance' in our Lord's Institution of the Sacrament. 'Do this,' He seems to say; 'bless, break, distribute, receive this bread; bless, distribute, drink of this cup;' say over the two respectively, 'This is My Body, this is My Blood;' in order to that memorial Sacrifice which properly belongs to Me, the memorial which My servants are continually to make of Me among one another and before My Father."—Keble on 'Eucharistic Adoration,' p. 68.

Let the reader remember the fact to which I have before alluded, that those who most consistently repudiate all notion of sacrifice in the Holy Communion, do not embody the account of the Institution in a prayer, but read it as a lesson of edification.

Thus, in the Directory agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, we have: "Let the words of Institution be read out of the Evangelists, or out of the First Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians, xi. 23, 'I have received of the Lord,' &c., to the 27th verse, which the minister may, when he seeth requisite, explain and apply."

This is taken from the 'Manner of Celebrating the *Lord's Supper*,' as laid down by Calvin, which runs

thus: "After Prayer and the Confession of Faith, to testify in the name of the people that all wish to live and die in the doctrine of Christ, he says aloud, 'Let us listen to the Institution of the Holy Supper by Jesus Christ, as narrated by St. Paul in the 11th chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians." Then follows the reading of this passage, and a long exposition of it, or exhortation grounded upon it, but *without a single direction for prayer;* and then comes the distribution.—(Calvin's Tracts, vol. ii., Calvin Society's Translation.)

Strange as this may seem to those who are accustomed, perhaps without much sense of its sacrificial significance, to say devoutly their "Amen" after our Consecration Prayer, it is well for all to remember that only by such a mode of administering can we effectually get rid of the "Sacrifice" in the Eucharist.

The memorial character of the Eucharist is its very essence as a religious institution.

If it were not a memorial before God it could not be a Sacrifice, for, as I have shown, it was the memorial nature of the acts prescribed in Leviticus which turned acts of common life into acts of religious sacrifice. 76

As some writers on the sacrificial side, in their desire to exalt the unique character of the Eucharistic celebration, seem to throw doubts on this, I would direct attention to the following extracts from writers of marked Catholic views,* and first of all from

Keble: "The places, it is true, are not many; but they are deeply significant. The keywords in them (so to speak) are such as 'remembrance,' 'memory,' 'memorial,' all which refer us of course to one of

* In addition to those I have already given in p. 85, almost all of which are directly to the point.

the words of Institution—'Do this in remembrance of Me' (εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν). The word anamnesis is a sacrificial word, as may be seen in Leviticus ii. and elsewhere, as well as the kindred word μνημόσυνον; and when so applied means always 'something offered to Almighty God to remind Him' of the worshipper himself, or of some other person or object in whom the worshipper takes an interest, or of His own loving kindness, shewn by mercies past or gracious promises for the future."—'Eucharistical Adoration,' p. 68.

Bishop Andrews: "That Sacrifice but once actually performed, but ever before represented in figure from the beginning, and ever since repeated, in memory, to the world's end."—Sermon on the Resurrection.

Archbishop Laud: "For as Christ offered up Himself once for all, a full and all-sufficient Sacrifice, so did He institute and command a memory of this Sacrifice in a Sacrament."—From 'Conference with Fisher,' §. 35, Punct. 3.

Johnson: "How could this be better done than by providing that it (the Sacrifice on the Cross) should be frequently and solemnly commemorated—not only commemorated but represented, not only to *man* but to *God*."—From his 'Propitiatory Oblation,' &c., pp. 44, 45.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor: "What Christ does in heaven He hath commanded us to do on earth, that is, to represent His Death, to commemorate His Sacrifice by humble prayer and thankful record, and by faithful manifestation and joyful Eucharist to lay it before the eyes of our heavenly Father."—'Worthy Communicant.'

One word more respecting this matter of "memorial."

It has been objected to the view of the Eucharist as a memorial "before God," that God knows the Sacrifice of His Son, and so needs not to be reminded of it.

It is difficult to treat with seriousness an objection which strikes at the root of all prayer, all praise, and all thanksgiving. God knows our necessities before we ask, and yet He bids us "pray without ceasing;" He knows far better than we do the number and the greatness of the blessings which He bestows upon us, and yet He bids us "in everything give thanks;" He only knows His own Majesty and Greatness, and yet He says, "*Let everything* that hath breath praise the Lord."

It is for our sakes, not for His, that He would have us pray to Him, and praise Him; for the habit of prayer increases the sense of our dependence upon Him, and so strengthens our faith; and the habit of praise and thanksgiving strengthens our sense of gratitude; and even if it did not, we must be in a wretched state if we can receive benefits from a benefactor and not acknowledge them.

But, above all, God has given to us a Mediator, and it is due to His Mercy in having given to us such a Way of access to Him that we should acknowledge our dependence upon this Mediator by coming to God through Him.

Now, what each individual does in His private intercourse with God when he names the Name of Jesus, the Church does in her Eucharistic celebrations. To use the words of Mede—

"That which we in all our prayers and thanksgivings do vocally when we say 'through Jesus Christ our Lord,' the ancient Church in her public and solemn service did visibly by representing Him according as He has commanded in the symbols of His Body and Blood; for there He is commemorated and received by us for the same end for which He was given and suffered for us."—From 'The Christian Sacrifice.'

XIII.

THE EUCHARIST A SACRIFICE OF PRAISE AND THANKSGIVING.

If the Eucharist be a memorial or commemorative Sacrifice of our Redemption by the Death of Christ, it must be also a memorial of our thankfulness for so unspeakable a benefit; and so all branches of the Catholic Church have regarded it as a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

In both the Canon of the Mass and in our own Service it is so regarded. In the one we have the words, "Be mindful, O Lord, of Thy servants, &c., and of all here present, whose faith and devotion are known unto Thee, for whom we offer, or who offer up to Thee, this Sacrifice of praise."

In the other, "We, Thy humble servants, entirely desire Thy Fatherly Goodness mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

And what is expressed in the words of these services is very plainly set forth in the writings of divines on both sides.

Leading Roman Catholic writers bring forward this Eucharistic feature of the Holy Sacrament as occupying the first place in the Church's conception of it. Thus—

Dr. Moehler: "The Church in general, and every particular community within her, being founded by the Sacrifice of the Son of God,

and by faith in the same, and thus owing their existence to Him, the Eucharistic Sacrifice must, *in the first place*, be regarded as one of praise and thanksgiving."—'Symbolism,' p. 233.

Again, on the other hand, leading Protestant divines seem desirous to concentrate attention on this aspect of it as a Sacrifice of praise, in order that by so doing they may exclude its (so-called) propitiatory element. Thus—

Ridley: "As though our unbloody Sacrifice of the Church were any other than the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a shewing forth, and a sacramental representation of that one only Bloody Sacrifice, offered up once for all."—'Ridley's Works' (Parker Society), p. 210.

This view of the Eucharist will require some further consideration.

It is clear that if the Eucharist be in any true and proper sense a Sacrifice of praise, it must be this independently of any acts of praise and thanksgiving which may accompany its celebration, but which are separable from it, and are not essential to its valid administration. The actual Eucharist consists in simply doing what Christ did. It is the presentation, consecration, and consumption of what has been consecrated; but the Church has always added to this certain acts of praise which can be used apart from the Eucharistic action, such, for instance, as the Trisagion or 'Holy, Holy, Holy,' and the 'Gloria in Excelsis.'

If it is the use of these acts of praise or thanksgiving alone which constitutes the Eucharist a Sacrifice of praise, then such hymns and thanksgivings are the real Eucharist.

We have seen how this aspect of the Eucharist (as a Sacrifice of praise) is the one especially recognised in

our own service in the words, "We, Thy humble servants, entirely desire Thy Fatherly Goodness mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

Now, let the reader particularly notice that, up to this point, there has been (apart from the Consecration itself) no act of praise and thanksgiving in our service, with the single exception of the Trisagion, or Angelic Hymn. In fact, up to this point, our service, so far as words are concerned, is less Eucharistic than any other known Liturgy. The chief elements in it have been the Penitential and the Hortatory, rather than the Eucharistic.

So that if our service be in any real and adequate sense a Sacrifice of praise, we must look for this element of praise and thansgiving to the Eucharistic action itself, i.e., to the actual Consecration. The real Sacrifice of thanksgiving must be here, for in our present service there is nothing else in which it can be.

And so it is. The Eucharist is the Eucharist, because it is the setting forth, in an outward and visible form, of the Death to which we owe all. It is the liveliest exhibition of God's greatest Mercy.

It is a very remarkable fact, and one which seems to me to have received nothing like the attention which it deserves, that the compilers of our present service, in their earnest desire to exclude any Romish view of Sacrifice, have contrived to bring out the fact that the bare Celebration is in itself a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving in a way in which it is brought out in no other Liturgy or Communion Office. They have superseded a service in which there were, at least, two acts of praise and thanksgiving before the petition "*Accept this* our sacrifice of praise," for a service in

which there is scarcely any element of praise except the Consecration itself.

In the first book of King Edward the Sixth, the 'Gloria in Excelsis' was at almost the beginning of the service, and just after the Consecration there was an act of praise running thus: "Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, according to the Institution of Thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make; having in remembrance His Blessed Passion, mighty Resurrection, and glorious Ascension: rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same; entirely desiring Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." What follows stands as in our present book.

The entire omission of this from our present book, as well as the removal of the 'Gloria in Excelsis,' throws us back upon the Consecration, i.e., upon the special Eucharistic action itself, for the Sacrifice of praise.

And now let me draw attention to a necessary deduction from all this.

If the Eucharist itself (apart from any acts of praise embodied in the service which may be separated from it without destroying its validity) be a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, because of its setting forth before God that precious Death to which we owe all, it must be a Sacrifice for other purposes besides praise and thanksgiving. If the lively exhibition of the Death of Christ be available for praising and thanking

God, it must equally be available for pleading with God.

Otherwise it would not correspond with that setting forth of His Death which Christ is now making at the Right Hand of God.

This heavenly "setting forth" is of course not for praise and thanksgiving so much as for deprecation of wrath, and all purposes of intercession for which His Mediation is needed. And so the Eucharist, which is the earthly counterpart of this heavenly setting forth, must also be for deprecation of wrath, and for all purposes of intercession.

If the solemn Memorial or Representation of the Death of Christ embodies, as it were, praise for Redemption, it must also embody the pleading of Redemption. It must be an act of intercession, for in it we join ourselves with His Intercession. It must be an invocation of mercy, for in it we shew forth the Death through which alone God can extend mercy to sinners.

So that if we acknowledge (as all seemingly do) that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice of praise, we acknowledge the whole principle of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

XIV.

THE SACRIFICE OF OURSELVES.

It will be needful to say a few words upon that sacrifice of ourselves which takes place at the Eucharist, and which is expressed in one of the Post-Eucharistic Thanksgivings in the words: "And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee."

Of course this is no part of the original institution. The Eucharist, as ordained by our Lord, if it was any offering in any sense whatsoever, was the offering of Himself to be crucified or immolated the next day. "This is My Body, which is being given for you." If He now offers His Church or people, it is simply in Himself, as part of Himself, incorporated into His Mystical Body, and animated by His Spirit. It is He, too, Who offers them, not themselves.

But at such a time as the celebration of the Eucharist an act of self-surrender on our part seems reasonable, seeing that the Sacrament is the memorial of so stupendous an act of self-sacrifice. And if the Eucharist be the presentation on earth of what He is now presenting in heaven, such an act of self-surrender seems peculiarly appropriate; for if in the presentation of Himself He is presenting His people, they can best

second this by presenting themselves in Him to be living sacrifices. But then this must be "in Him," otherwise we destroy the evangelical nature of the Sacrifice of ourselves by making it, so far as we can, an independent Sacrifice.

We, as sinners needing mediation, cannot offer anything to God except in and through that Mediator Whom He has provided, and the Eucharist is the Church's expression of this. If we offer ourselves, it is not as in any sense an independent offering, but simply as forming part of that Mystical Body to which, in the Eucharist, the faithful are united, and so are held by God to be in Christ and offered in Himself when He presents Himself at the Right Hand of God. To make (as some seem to desire to do) this offering of ourselves to be the principal feature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, or an independent part of it, or one of a number of sacrifices of which the Eucharist is composed, is simply to rob the Eucharist of its evangelical character, and, in fact, to destroy the whole meaning and intent of the institution of sacrificial worship.

For the whole truth and reality of the sacrificial system, as it has existed by God's ordination from the time of Abel to the time of Christ, is this—that man, being sinful, needs an atonement for sin, and that he is unable to make this atonement either by himself or by means of anything which proceeds from himself. The atonement must be something apart from himself. No individual of the race can present to God for His acceptance any product of his own spiritual being, as for instance, his repentance, his faith, his obedience; he must present before God as atoning worship something out of Himself, generally an independent life—a life, *that is, which* man has not given or communicated

— some innocent creature not partaking of the moral evil of man's fall. This is admirably expressed by Johnson:

"It is, I suppose, very evident that none was ever allowed to make expiation for himself by anything that he was capable of doing as a private person. The High Priest, when he had sinned, was indeed to expiate his own act; but it was by virtue of an Eternal Sacrifice instituted by God for this purpose; not by any prayer, or faith, or internal act of religion. He was to apply himself to God 'by the blood of other' creatures, to show that nothing which proceeds *ab intus*, from within ourselves, can either make satisfaction for our sins, or make application of the satisfaction made by another."—'Unbloody Sacrifice.'

And as it is with individuals, so with the race. The whole human race has nothing proceeding out of itself which it can offer to God. And so the Great Atonement was made by a Priest and a Victim Who, though He had made Himself the Son of Man, could yet say, "I am from above;" "I am not of this world." "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world." Now the Eucharist, considered as a Sacrifice, or rather as the presentation on earth of the One Sacrifice, is the highest expression of all this. I have never seen this most evangelical meaning of the great Gospel Ordinance more feelingly expressed than in the following words of a Roman Catholic writer, Moehler. In his 'Symbolism' he writes:

"The Church declares that she is incapable of offering up her thanks to God in any other way than by giving Him back Who became the Victim of the world; as if she were to say, 'Thou didst, O Lord, for Christ's sake, look down with graciousness and compassion upon us as Thy children; so vouchsafe that we, with grateful hearts, may revere Thee as our Father in Christ, Thy Son, here present. We possess naught else that we can offer Thee, save Christ; be graciously pleased to receive our sacrifice.' While the community, in the person of the priest, performeth this, it confesses perpetually what Christ became, and still continues to be, for its sake."

Again:

"The assembled congregation declares, from what we have stated, that *in itself, without Christ*, it discovers nothing—absolutely nothing—which can be agreeable to God; nay, nothing but what is inadequate, earthly, and sinful. Renouncing itself, it gives itself up to Christ, full of confidence, hoping for His sake [for] forgiveness of sins, and eternal life, and every grace. In this act of self-renunciation and of entire self-abandonment to God in Christ, the believer has, as it were, thrown off himself, excommunicated himself, if I may so speak, in his existence, as separated from Christ, in order to live only by Him and in Him. Hence he is in a state to enter into the most intimate fellowship with Christ, to commune with Him, and with His whole being to be entirely absorbed in Him. For the unseemliness of the congregation no longer communicating every Sunday (as was the case in the Primitive Church), and of the Priest in the Mass usually receiving alone the Body of the Lord, is not to be laid to the blame of the Church (for all the prayers in the Holy Sacrifice presuppose the Sacramental Communion of the entire congregation), but is to be ascribed solely to the tepidity of the greater part of the faithful.* Yet are the latter earnestly exhorted to participate, at least spiritually, in the Communion of the Priest, and in this way to enter into the fellowship of Christ" (p. 236).

And now (though with great reluctance) I cannot help presenting by way of contrast, and so as a means of bringing out the truth with greater definiteness, the words of a leading dignitary in a very exalted position in our own Church, in which he appears of set purpose to exclude from the Eucharist all representation of —indeed, all connection with—the atoning Sacrifice of Christ. I will not mention his name, because the extract is taken from a newspaper report of a sermon, and I desire to take the words (as much as may be), apart

* Surely one who could thus express himself, and who also speaks of the "Community in the person of the Priest" performing [the Sacrifice], and who also says that "we should rejoice, if it were left free to each one to drink, or not, of the consecrated chalice" (p. 243) *would, had he* lived to this day, thrown in his lot with the Old Catholic *movement.*

from their authorship, as well expressing the antagonistic view. And very beautiful and appropriate words they are, if the subject were some civil or religious ceremony other than the Eucharist. He asks:

"In what sense over and above the essential sacrifice of our Redeemer and our own personal sacrifice in our daily lives, in what sense is there a sacrifice in our worship, and especially in that chiefest ordinance of the Christian Church, the Holy Communion? It is clear that to form part of the sacrificial system already mentioned, any sacrifice in outward worship must include prayer and praise, beneficence and self-devotion. First, then, the Lord's Supper is, as its name Eucharist implies, and as it is described in our Prayer-books, a 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.' Thus, as we say, 'It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God,' and in the ancient service books, of which we have very slight remains in our Office, this sacrificial idea was further expressed by the Christian people bringing to the holy table loaves and wine as first-fruits. In our Church this principle is still indicated in the Prayer for the Church Militant, where we offer to God 'our oblations,' answering to the offering of the Host in the old Roman Church, which meant not the offering of the dead corpse by the priest, but the offering to God by the people of bread and wine, as the best fruits of His beautiful and bountiful creation. In the earlier service books this symbolised the offering of praise and thanksgiving. But, secondly, in the Lord's Supper, there has always been the collection of alms for the poor, which is called in our own Church and elsewhere the Offertory, the offering. Here, again, it is clear that the Sacrifice is made not by the minister, but by the congregation. They make their sacrificial offerings, and in them God is well pleased. But, thirdly, the whole service is a sacrifice and dedication of ourselves. In the service of the English Reformed Church this is brought out more clearly than in the Roman or other Churches, and here, again, we have a sacrifice not offered by the priest for the people, but by the people for themselves. When he says, 'We offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee,' he speaks only as their representative. These, then, are the three ideas of sacrifice running through the service, and in no other sense is the thought of sacrifice present in the Eucharist. These ideas absorb all others. When we see the bread and wine placed on the table, they should remind us of the blessings, the mercies, yea, and the

sorrows of our daily lives. When we drop our offerings in the dish, of gold, or silver, or copper, as the case may be, we should remember that true Christian communion requires as an essential condition true Christian beneficence, not only then, but at all times, to be shown in the best and wisest manner. And when we dedicate ourselves at the holy table our act and words should remind us that not only then, but in all places, the sweet savour of our self-dedication should go up to God. Other ideas are bound up with the Lord's Supper, but the whole idea of sacrifice in it is contained in these."

Now the reader will notice that if these be the only sacrificial or devotional elements in Holy Communion, then, in such a case, it is scarcely Christian; for the characteristic rite of the religion of the Son of God (if it have no other sacrificial aspect than this) might be joined in by one who believed the Great Institutor of it to be an impostor, or who did not believe in His existence. The whole passage appears to me to be most instructive. It teaches us that they who would exclude from the Eucharist its function of representing before God the Sacrifice of Christ, can only do so by making it an independent sacrifice (or a congeries of independent sacrifices), and its ministers independent priests; for these three things, thanks for the fruits of the earth, alms, and self-dedication, specified and particularly insisted on, so that "in no other sense is the thought of Sacrifice present in the Eucharist;" these three things, I say, are supposed to be offered in no ordained connection with the Sacrifice of Christ. Moreover, to offer these things the priests who offer or preside at the ceremony need, so far as I can see, no commission to represent Christ, or to do anything in His Name. And secondly, we are taught by these words that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is so mysteriously connected with the Sacrifice of Christ that they who, in reference to the language of the Universal Church,

would hold it to contain acts of sacrifice, and yet deny it to be *the* great Memorial Oblation, can only do so by keeping out of sight even the merest emblematical reference to the All-atoning Death; for the reader will notice that the only use of the elements mentioned is that they should be emblems to us of earthly blessings. "When we see the bread and wine placed on the table they should remind us of the blessings, the mercies, yea, and the sorrows of our daily lives."

Let the reader understand that my reason for drawing attention to this passage is this—that in it the Holy Eucharist is recognised as containing sacrifice, but merely inferior sacrifice—sacrifice which can form no part of the essence of the Eucharist itself—whilst *the* Sacrifice, i.e., the setting forth or representation of the All-atoning Death, seems to be carefully excluded.

XV

IS THE EUCHARIST A PROPER SACRIFICE?

WE have now to consider a question which is supposed to touch vitally the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; and which, at the present time, is assumed to bear equally decisively upon the question of the ritual with which it should be celebrated.*

This question is, Is the Eucharist a proper sacrifice? Is it a true sacrifice—a sacrifice *veri nominis*—or, indeed, a literal sacrifice? In investigating this matter we shall have to remember the very great difficulty of defining what a sacrifice is.†

* Out of any number of similar assertions I select this: "He must emphatically proclaim his own conviction that the symbolism of Eucharistic vestments, and the symbolism of the Eastward position, as they were now told they must understand them, were symbolisms of a doctrine that was not the doctrine of the Church of England, and which could not be proved from Holy Scripture—he meant the doctrine that ministers in the Holy Sacrament were discharging the functions of a proper priesthood, and that what they offered to God was a proper and propitiatory sacrifice."—Bishop of Manchester's Speech at a meeting of the Manchester Diocesan Synod.

† Dr. Waterland expresses this difficulty very strongly in his chapter on 'The Eucharist considered in a Sacrificial View.' Speaking of the controversy between the Lutheran Pfaffius and Dr. Grabe, he says, "In short he (Pfaffius) seems almost to yield up everything that Dr. Grabe had contended for, excepting only the point of a proper or material sacrifice; and he looked upon that as resolving at length into a kind of logomachy—a difference in *words* or *names*, arising chiefly from the difficulty of determining what a sacrifice properly means, *and from the almost insuperable perplexities among learned men about the ascertaining any precise definition of it.*"

For there are three things to which the Church has agreed to give this name of "Sacrifice," and yet no definition will cover any two of them—I mean no definition which is built upon the outward features of these Sacrifices; though, as I shall show, there is a definition which will cover all of them, but it is built wholly upon their spiritual use and intent, not upon their outward features.

These three things are:

1. The Jewish Sacrifice (burnt-offering, meat-offering, peace, sin, trespass-offerings).

2. The Sacrifice of the Son of God upon the Cross.

3. The Eucharist.

A very little consideration will serve to show the reader that not one of these three has any outward feature really the same as those of the other two; but in order to do this we shall have to look at each of these three things apart from its spiritual meaning, and see how each one would appear to a bystander, who did not enter into its religious import.

1. The Jewish Sacrifice was the slaughter of a creature fit for food, in order that it might be consumed or eaten.

2. The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ was a most cruel and unjust execution, wickedly inflicted upon an innocent Man, and willingly submitted to on His part.

3. The Eucharist is the partaking of bread and wine which has been consecrated by a prayer—a very peculiar prayer, because one which always contains a recital of the words and acts of Christ in the original Institution.

Let us dwell a little on each of these.

The Jewish Sacrifice (except the mincha, to which I shall afterwards advert) was in outward form the slaughter of a domestic animal fit for human food. It was slaughtered, so far as we can gather from the

sacred history, in the same manner as any other creature which was intended to be eaten.

This is very distinctly set forth in the permission to eat flesh (Deut. xii. 13)—"Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt-offerings in every place that thou seest: but in the place which the Lord shall choose in one of thy tribes, there shalt thou offer thy burnt-offerings, and there shalt thou do all that I command thee. Notwithstanding, thou mayest kill and eat flesh in all thy gates, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after . . . only ye shall not eat the blood, ye shall pour it upon the earth like water." Now, where it is said "Thou mayest kill and eat flesh," it is literally, "Thou mayest sacrifice and eat flesh," the word meaning "to sacrifice" and "to kill" being the same: so that, as I have before noticed, the things which transformed this slaying into a religious rite of atonement were certain accompanying rites, all performed for a religious purpose.

First, the creature to be slain as a sacrifice was not to be sacrificed anywhere, but brought to a certain spot —the door of the tabernacle—as the one place dedicated to the religious service of God.

Then the offerer laid his hands upon it, with the definite religious intention (expressed by this act) of devoting it to God. Then the creature was slain, but by whom we are not told, probably by one of the Levites. Then, for the first time, the priest—the minister of religion—comes in; for instead of the blood having to be poured on the ground, as in the case of the creature killed for food, it must be presented by him for atonement, by being sprinkled about the altar, or poured out at the foot of the altar.

After this came the consumption upon an altar dedi*cated to God to* be His Table by rites by far the most

solemn and imposing of any commanded in the Pentateuch (Numbers vii.):– This dedication being forcibly recognised by our Lord Himself in the words, "The altar which sanctifieth the gift."

I would now draw attention to two circumstances connected with the Jewish Sacrifice, the importance of which the reader will soon understand.

1. The Jewish Sacrifice was the mactation of an irrational, and so an unwilling victim. It is true that the owner of it must offer it of "his own free will;" but, nevertheless, he offered for his atonement the life-blood of that which could not consent to the offering.

2. But, in the second place, it is a most noticeable fact that prayer and praise formed no essential part of any Levitical sacrifice. I mean, of course, no verbal acts of prayer or praise. In the Book of Leviticus we have the most minute directions respecting five kinds of sacrifices, and in several cases directions respecting the different varieties of these. For instance, in the first chapter, we have the differences to be observed between the manner of offering, or sacrificing, if the burnt-offering be a bullock, a sheep, a goat, or a turtle dove. In the second chapter there are the differences between three or four kinds of minchas specified. In the fourth we have distinguished from one another the sin-offerings of the priest, the congregation, the ruler, or any one of the common people; but, amidst these minute directions, there is not a single word respecting any prayer, or thanksgiving, or confession of sin, as forming a necessary part of the ceremony or ritual of any Jewish sacrifice.

In the case of the trespass-offering (Levit. v. 5) there is a direction that the guilty person should confess his

sin, but this is to be done before he brings his offering. So also the High Priest confessed over the scape-goat the sins of the children of Israel, but that goat was not slain. So that the Levitical offering, as it appears in the Book of Leviticus itself, is without any verbal act of prayer or praise forming part of its institution, and therefore essential to its validity.

Let me not be misunderstood as if I thought that such sacrifices could be presented by any Israelite of the most ordinary piety without prayer. It would be impossible for any Israelite who realised his relations to the One True God to restrain prayer at such a time.

I am also well aware that, in a later age, there was a service of Psalmody in the Temple, and that hours of prayer were observed, and that Rabbinical writers give sacrificial forms of prayer (of which the date is probably subsequent to the destruction of the Temple;) but all this does not touch the fact that, whilst minute directions were given respecting the mode of offering, not only each class of sacrifices, but each variety of each class, there is not a word said respecting prayer, praise, or thanksgiving, as forming an essential part of the ritual; and I believe that this silence is intentional.

And now let us turn to the Sacrifice of Christ. Its outward form presents the greatest possible contrast to the outward form of the Jewish Offering.

The Sacrifice of the Son of God was His submission to a horrible and degrading form of punishment by death. It was inflicted by those who had power to do so, not for any religious or expiatory purpose, but through malice and envy. It was (apparently) inflicted on the Sufferer because of His witness for God and His truth. *The actual* infliction of the Death presented no

feature which, in the smallest degree, resembled the slaying of any victim in Jewish worship.

The actual inflictors of the Death thought that they were executing a guilty person.

The Victim, instead of suffering involuntarily, laid down His Life "of Himself," being the only human being who had power to lay it down, and power to take it again. Moreover, the dreadful nature and circumstances of His Death had been distinctly present to His consciousness all through His Life.

The altar on which He was slain was an instrument of torture neither in figure, material, or use, resembling the altar of Jewish Sacrifice.*

There was no human priest there and then to present His Blood in any Holy Place. The Body, instead of being consumed, was, like the body of any other person of any consideration, laid in a sepulchre, and there It was expected to remain.

But this is not all, or anything like all, the contrast between the typical and the anti-typical Sacrifice.

The Sacrifice of Christ was one great Sacrament of Reconciliation, having its outward and its inward part:- Its outward part was on the Cross on Calvary:- Its inward part in the Eternal Counsel of God.

* Strictly speaking, the Jewish altar does not correspond to the Cross, because the Jewish victim was not slain upon the altar, but near it; but Isaac, the truest type of Christ, was slain in intention, "on the altar upon the wood" (Gen. xxii. 9). The use of the Jewish altar, as I have before noticed, came in after the atonement was made. It "sanctified the gift," so that it should be consumed as the food of God: and from it the priests and people partook as of the food of God; so that, in the strictest sense, the altar of the All-atoning Sacrifice is that Table from which Christians partake of the Sacrifice. Still, because the lively showing forth of the Death of Christ takes place upon it, our altar-table corresponds to the Cross itself in a way in which the Jewish altar did not.

It was the fulfilment of God's eternal design to reconcile all things to Himself, not by a mere outward ceremonial reconciliation (though even this was necessary, for sin had defiled the whole being of man),* but by a reconciliation so complete that God could "dwell in men."

The Son of God, in fulfilment of this will or design of God, came amongst us, and by assuming our nature became the new and sinless Head of the race. As this Second Man, His submission in all things to do and suffer the will of God was so meritorious, that God was enabled, consistently with His Justice, to look upon men as in Him, and to take hold of them and raise them up again to heaven in Him (Ephes. ii. 5, 6).

All this, and infinitely more than heart can conceive, or tongue can utter, is the inner or Divine side of the Sacrifice on Calvary.

Now, there was nothing of all this in the Jewish Offering. It pointed to It, prefigured It, and prepared men for It; but, in the nature of things, no earthly thing could resemble in outward form such an eternal and infinite act of Reconciliation.

The reconciling act of the Eternal Son, if it can be called an Offering or Sacrifice, cannot but be the only true, proper, and literal Sacrifice. It can be the only Sacrifice *veri nominis*—the only real, reconciling, atoning Sacrifice. If we leave out of consideration the mincha, the very sacrificial name under which Malachi prophesies of Christian sacrificial worship, it may be

* Some such reconciliation is alluded to in Acts x. 15—"What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common." These words show that some cleansing had passed over the whole Gentile world, which is *represented in the* vision of the great sheet full of unclean beasts, which *God pronounced to* have been cleansed.

true that in the Jewish Sacrifice, as well as in that of the Cross, there was the actual infliction of Death; and on this account Divines have classed both as "proper" sacrifices; but the two inflictions were so enormously different in their purposes and their circumstances—they were in two such different spheres, so to speak—that it seems manifestly wrong to account the mere infliction of death as the thing which constitutes a proper sacrifice.

I cannot believe that the mere infliction of death can so bring two such different things under the category of "proper" sacrifices, that the Levitical Sacrifice (not being a mincha) should be a proper sacrifice, and the Christian Eucharist, because it contains no actual infliction of death, be an improper one, or not one at all.

The Sacrifice of the Death of Christ is so unique in its nature, so peculiar, and so stands by itself, as it were, that any definition of sacrifice which would include the Jewish Sacrifice as sharing with it the essential property of Sacrifice, and exclude the Eucharist from being a real, true Sacrifice, seems wrong, and for this reason, that the more faith a Jew brought to the understanding of his Sacrifice, the more unreal in itself it would appear to him, because it would the more appear to be what it really was—a shadow; whereas, the more faith a Christian brings to the words in which Christ instituted the Eucharist, the more clearly he discerns how, by His own word of Power, and for His own purposes of Grace, Christ has identified it with His own Sacrifice.

St. Paul, too, considers the Paschal Feast on the true Paschal Victim to be ever present in the Church when he says, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast." Neither the Paschal

Feast nor the Paschal Victim has passed away; for, as we sing at Easter Tide, "He *is* the Very Paschal Lamb."

And now let us turn to the Eucharist.

The Eucharist, in every age and in every part of the Catholic Church, appears under the form which I have stated. Divested of all accessory prayers or forms which do not touch its essence, it is the Consecration or Blessing of bread and wine by a very peculiar prayer, because a prayer which contains the account of the original Institution, which, being in a Prayer, is recited before Almighty God. These consecrated elements are partaken of, not as common food, but as the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.

There may be, and no doubt there are, great differences in the forms and words of particular liturgies. One may contain ancient forms which another has not. One may have such a multiplicity of minute forms, such as crossings and genuflections, that the Institution itself almost disappears under them; another may be (I think most foolishly) stripped of everything that can speak to the eye. Above all, some of these offices or liturgies may contain far more direct sacrificial terms than others; but, when every difference is taken into account, the kernel or nucleus of all these rites—those Divinely-ordained words and actions which make it to be the Holy Thing which Christ ordained—remain the same (see Appendix B.).

But at this time my purpose is not so much to show the identity of the Eucharist, wherever celebrated, as to impress upon the reader that, no matter how celebrated, it is and always has been absolutely the same thing, if compared with any Levitical Sacrifice; for no single *feature of* any form of celebrating the Eucharist bears

the smallest resemblance to any feature of any Jewish Sacrifice.

Take the Mincha, the Sacrifice under the name of which the prophet Malachi predicts the universal celebration of the Eucharist itself. This is the bread or flour offering, and its ritual is thus described:—

"And when any will offer a meat-offering unto the Lord, his offering shall be of fine flour; and he shall pour oil upon it, and put frankincence thereon: and he shall bring it to Aaron's sons, the priests, and he shall take thereout his handful of the flour thereof, and of the oil thereof, with all the frankincence thereof; and the priest shall burn the memorial of it upon the altar, to be an offering made by fire of a sweet savour unto the Lord; and the remnant of the meat-offering shall be Aaron's and his sons; it is a thing most holy of the offerings of the Lord made by fire." (Lev. ii. 1–4.)

I need hardly assure the most unlearned reader that in no part of Christendom has any mode of celebrating the Eucharist resembled this in the smallest degree.

It may be thought that in all this I am fighting with some shadow; but it is to be remembered that writer after writer on the anti-sacrificial side has asserted, or implied, that those who believe that there is a proper or real Sacrifice of some sort in the Eucharist, must believe also that in some way or other the Death of Christ is reiterated therein, and so that such persons must, in consistency, express this belief by copying the Jewish sacrificial ritual.

We have such a man as Calvin, for instance, asserting, not respecting the ceremonial of the Mass of his day, but respecting the far less elaborate mode of celebrating in the ancient Church, that "They (the early Christians) imitated the Jewish mode of sacrificing more closely

than either Christ had ordained or the nature of the Gospel allowed." ('Institutes,' book iv., ch. xviii., sec. 11). And he proceeds gravely to argue, in the next section, that as the difference was very great between the two, the mode of celebrating ought to be different!!

Now, it is a deplorable fact that misconceptions similar to this lie at the root of the divisions in our own Church respecting the ritual of the Lord's Supper. They first appear, or take form, at the earliest possible date—i.e., between the publications of the first and second Prayer-books of Edward VI. The controversy which then commenced continued, with little intermission, till the Restoration. It died out with the almost extinction of all corporate Church life in the following century and a half (i.e., from shortly after the Restoration till the close of the first quarter of the present century), and has revived with the revival of Church principles in our day. In our Church the name and position of the altar was the standard, as it were, round which the battle raged. It was assumed that an altar implied a sacrifice, and a proper altar a proper sacrifice; and, conversely, a proper sacrifice necessitated the use of a proper altar. Now, the Romanists asserted that in the Eucharist there was a proper sacrifice; and it was supposed that, notwithstanding their repeated denials, they reiterated the Sacrifice of Christ, or in some evil way supplemented it as not an all-sufficient Sacrifice; and it was supposed that, because they did this, their altar was a "proper" altar, and so it must be made, if possible, unlike an altar of propitiatory Sacrifice, such as was the Jewish altar.*

* *Thus, in 'Reasons* why the Lord's Board should rather be after

The beginning of all this letting out of the waters of strife were the Injunctions set forth between the publications of Edward VI.'s two Prayer-books. The object of the changes to be made according to these injunctions was to obliterate from the minds of the people the Sacrifice of the Mass, and to substitute for it the Communion as it is embodied in our book; of course this Communion being, as the book itself sets forth, a "Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."*

In order to this, the altars were everywhere to be so changed as regards their material, shape, place, and furniture, as no longer to be, or to resemble, a "proper" altar.

With this view they were ordered by these Injunctions to be removed from the east end of the church, which was supposed to be the place of a proper or true altar, to nearer the middle of the building. Their material was to be no longer stone, but wood—the material, of course, of the Altar of the Cross, but not for that reason. Their shape was also to be changed; and, as

---

the form of a table than of an altar,' by Bishop Ridley, the fourth reason is, "The form of an altar was ordained for the sacrifices of the Law, and therefore the altar in Greek is called *θυσιαστήριον—quasi sacrificii locus*. But now both the Law and the sacrifices thereof do cease: wherefore the form of the altar used in the altar ought to cease withal."—Parker Society's Works of Ridley, p. 323.

* "Whereas in divers places some use the Lord's Board after the form of a table, and some of an altar, whereby dissension is perceived to arise among the unlearned: therefore, wishing a godly unity to be observed in all our diocese, and for that the form of a table may more and more turn the simple from the old superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass, and to the right use of the Lord's Supper, we exhort the curates, churchwardens, and questmen here present, to erect and set up the Lord's Board after the form of an honest table, decently covered, in such place of the quire or chancel as shall be thought most meet."—'Injunctions,' 1550, p. 319, Ridley's Works.

far as I can gather, to be made square rather than oblong, but of this I am not certain.

In these ways the ancient "altar" was supposed to be turned into a "table."

Now, let us look to the altar of burnt-offering, which, as there is supposed to be no altar in the Christian Church, and as there must have been at some time such a thing as an altar, cannot but be the typical, or real, or "proper" altar.

In the first place it was an open grate or fireplace. Small at first, because it had to be carried from place to place on the shoulders of Levites; but when a permanent House of God was erected, then it assumed far greater dimensions, being in the Temple of Solomon thirty-five feet square, at least, and fifteen feet high, and in the later temple more than sixty feet square. This size was required (indeed, it was insufficient for the offerings at the dedication of the temple) when we consider the number of the burnt-offerings (exclusive of the paschal offerings) which were offered; twenty-two thousand oxen and one hundred and twenty thousand sheep by Solomon; two thousand bullocks and seventeen thousand sheep by Hezekiah and his princes; three thousand bullocks by Josiah. In many cases the whole, and in all cases the fat, of all these creatures had to be laid in order and burnt upon this erection. Of course such a thing could only be in the open air, that the smoke might ascend and be dissipated. If anything resembling it, or put to any similar use, could by possibility find a place in the largest of our cathedrals, that place could not be at the end of an apse, or against a wall, or under an east window. The material of this altar was, at the first, of wood covered with brass; *then in Solomon's* temple brass only. In the later

temple it was built of unhewn stones. The top was covered with a grating, and there was a network all around, to prevent the embers from escaping. Of course such an erection would have no furniture or ornaments in the smallest degree resembling those of any Christian altar or Lord's table. The vessels of the altar are particularised in Exodus xxxviii. 3, as "the pots, and the shovels, and the basons, and the fleshhooks, and the firepans." I need not say that, with respect to the things which now adorn, or overload, our altars, or super-altars—books, candlesticks, crosses (wooden or metal), vases for flowers, linen cloths, lace veils, palls of velvet or silk, frontals—this typical, or proper, altar was the place of all others where such things could not be.

These things on our altars may be good or bad; they may add to the dignity of our worship, or they may detract from it; they may be taken to symbolise the holiest things, or to be the badges of a corrupt system; but one thing is certain, that the presence of any one of them on an altar necessitates that the sacrifice on that altar should be as unlike as possible to that which men account "proper" sacrifice.

But a sacrifice is not merely something on an altar, but an act of worship performed upon or at an altar. When, then, the altar was removed from its accustomed place, and its shape and material changed, so as to make it a table, what was the act of worship which was ordered to be done upon it? Why, precisely the same thing which was done upon it when it was supposed to be a "proper" altar. Bread and wine were consecrated by a prayer in which the priest recited before Almighty God the account of the original Institution by His Son Jesus Christ.

Now, in order to show this, I have a right to take

the first Prayer-book of Edward VI., because it was the book which was in use when this change of the table into an altar was made by the Injunctions; but I will not do this. I will take the Prayer of Consecration as it stood in Romish times, because the purpose of the changes was to obliterate the notions of sacrifice attached to the Roman Mass. There are very grave differences between this prayer and the one we now use, but these do not in the slightest degree alter the fact that the same thing was ordered to be done at the thing which was supposed to be an altar, and at the thing which was supposed to have become a table.

The same thing, I say, compared with what had been ordained to be done at the Levitical, i.e., the "proper" altar.

Now, in order that the reader may have no doubt respecting this, I will put, side by side, the three actions —the action at the Levitical Altar, the action at the Pre-Reformation Altar, and the action at the Holy Table.

THE JEWISH SACRIFICIAL ACT.	THE ROMISH SACRIFICIAL ACT.	THE ANGLICAN ACT.
THE BURNT-OFFERING.—Levit. i. If his offering *be* a burnt sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish: he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the LORD. And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him. And he shall kill the bullock before the Lord: and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall bring the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar that *is by* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. *And he shall flay* the	Which oblation [*of bread and a mixed cup*] do Thou, O God Almighty, vouchsafe to make altogether blessed, meet and right, reasonable and acceptable, that to us it may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly-beloved Son, Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who, the day before He suffered, took bread into His Holy and Venerable Hands, and lifting up His eyes to heaven [*here let him raise his eyes*] to Thee, O God, His Father Almighty, and giving thanks to Thee, He blessed and brake it, and [*here let him touch the Host*] gave it to His disciples, saying, Take and eat ye all of this, for this is My Body [and these	Then shall the Priest, kneeling down at God's board, say, in the name of all them that shall receive the Communion, this prayer following— We do not presume to come to this Thy Table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in Thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under Thy Table. But Thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy; Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His

burnt-offering, and cut it into his pieces. And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar, and lay the wood in order upon the fire. And the priests, Aaron's sons, shall lay the parts, the head, and the fat, in order upon the wood that *is* on the fire which *is* upon the altar. But his inwards and his legs shall he wash in water: and the priest shall burn all on the altar, *to be* a burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

THE PEACE-OFFERING.—Levit. iii.

And if his oblation *be* a sacrifice of peace-offering, if he offer *it* of the herd; whether *it be* a male or female, he shall offer it without blemish before the LORD. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, and kill it *at* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation: and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about. And he shall offer of the sacrifice of the peace-offering an offering made by fire unto the LORD; the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that *is* upon the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* on them, which *is* by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall he take away. And Aaron's sons shall burn it on the altar upon the burnt sacrifice, which *is* upon the wood that *is* on the fire: *it is* an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

words must be uttered at one breath and at one recital (prolatione), *no pause intervening. After these words let him raise it above his forehead that it may be seen by the people, and reverently replace it before the chalice in the form of a cross made through the same, and then he shall uncover the chalice and hold it between his hands not disjoining the thumb from the forefinger unless whilst he makes benedictions only: thus saying*] In like manner after they had supped, taking also the noble cup into His Holy and Venerable Hands, and giving thanks to Thee, He blessed it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take and drink ye all of this [*Here let him raise the chalice slightly, saying*] For this is the cup of My Blood of the New and Everlasting Testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many for the remission of sins [*Here he elevates the chalice, saying*] As oft as ye shall do this ye shall do it in remembrance of Me [*Here let him replace the chalice and elevate his arms in the form of a cross*].

Wherefore, O Lord, in memory of the same Thy Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, of His blessed Passion, as well as of His Resurrection from the grave and glorious Ascension into Heaven, we Thy servants, and also Thy Holy People, offer to Thy Illustrious Majesty, of Thine own gifts which Thou hast given, a pure offering, an holy offering, an undefiled offering, even the Holy Bread of Eternal Life, and the Cup of Everlasting Salvation. — The rubrics of the above are principally from the Use of Sarum in Maskel's 'Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England,' the translation is from the Annotated Prayer-book.

most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us. *Amen.*

Then the Priest standing up shall say as followeth—

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, Who of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; Who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that His precious Death, until His coming again; Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee; and grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His Death and Passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood: Who, in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread; and, when He had given thanks, He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is My Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of Me. Likewise after supper He took the Cup; and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me. *Amen.*

In comparing these three modes of worship the reader will notice, in the first place, that the sacrificial actions of the Levitical worship, such as killing, sprinkling the blood, flaying, cutting in pieces, laying in order on the altar, and burning, are in both the Christian acts of worship represented by a prayer—an exceedingly simple prayer, and yet a very remarkable one, because in both cases embodying the account of what Christ did at the first Lord's Supper, and in this, of course, differing from all other Christian prayers whatsoever. So that, whilst in the Jewish Sacrifice there is a marked absence of any direction respecting saying any particular prayer and thanksgiving, in the Christian act the outward symbols are subject to the action of prayer and thanksgiving only.

Then, in the next place, the reader will perceive that by far the most noticeable difference between the Roman and the Anglican form consists in the multiplicity of rubrics respecting manual and such like acts which exist in the Roman form, and of which the Anglican Consecration Prayer in its then state was totally divested. But he will also notice that not one of these manual acts bears the slightest resemblance to any manual act of the "proper" sacrifice. So that, compared with the essentials of a "proper" sacrifice, the very same thing was ordered to be done at the "table" which had been done at the altar.

Now, a very different thing indeed might have been ordered to be done—a thing which would have made the reformed service essentially different from the unreformed. The Consecration Prayer might have been abolished, and the account of the original Institution, *instead* of being embodied in a prayer to Almighty God, *might have* been ordered to be read and expounded

to the people, as is the case in Calvin's directory. If this had been done, all idea of Sacrifice of any sort would have been got rid of, and the Eucharist could no longer have been mistaken for an act of worship, much less for a sacrifice of any kind.

I have again to apologise to the reader for supposing him to require any such a comparison of the Jewish and Christian rites; but let him remember that this confusion about a "proper" and an "improper" sacrifice has been introduced in a former age by such statements as those of Calvin which I have quoted; that it has been the source, and yet is the source, of much unnecessary division; and that it must be got rid of before men can be made to receive and realise the true idea of the Eucharist. For if we apply to the Eucharistic Sacrifice such a term as "improper," we apply to it a term of [supposed] disparagement which no further explanations on our part will remove—a term which nine-tenths of religious Englishmen will think to be more disparaging than we intend. And we necessarily relegate the idea of proper sacrifice to an abrogated system, as if its place was in the Levitical system, and not in the Christian.

But such a thing cannot be, for if there be but one true and all-sufficient Sacrifice, and yet if we are permitted to call any acts of human worship by this name of Sacrifice, then that act comes the nearest to a proper sacrifice which is the most closely identified with the one true Sacrifice, and this the Eucharist is.

We have seen, then, how no definition can be found to cover the things which have ever been called sacrifices, because no definition derived from outward features will cover things which have really no outward features in common; and this leads us to a definition which is

derived from a spiritual resemblance rather than an outward feature of similarity, and this is the definition of one bearing no less a name in the Church of God than St Augustine, who, in his 'City of God,' defines a sacrifice to be "every act which is performed with the purpose of joining us to God in an holy bond of union." (De Civ. Dei x. c. vi.)*

This definition, and this alone, of all that I have seen, will cover the three things which men have been taught to call sacrifices.

For the Jewish Sacrifices, temporary and imperfect though they were, were given by God in order that men should continue within the pale of His covenant through the typical cleansing effected by them, and that they should eat from His Table in token of amity or renewed union. And the one only real Sacrifice of Calvary was given in order that men might be united to God in the bonds of the new and better covenant; and the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the perpetual pledge and seal of this; for by It we join ourselves to God in the holiest bond of union, because we join ourselves to the Presentation of Himself which Christ is now making for us in Heaven; and by partaking of this Sacrificial Bread and Cup, we partake of that which He has given, in order that we may dwell in Him and He in us.

* I have been reminded that such a definition as this will include Baptism; and so it will, for Baptism, in so far as it is a public dedication to God, is a Sacrifice. Perhaps the definition, to make it more perfect, should contain a reference to worship, and to something set before God for His acceptance.

XVI.

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE AND SACERDOTALISM.

An attempt is made on all sides of us to prejudice Christian people against the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice by connecting it with Sacerdotalism or Priestcraft. I hope to show that the objection raised on this score is as hollow and as beside the mark as any other objection which I have noticed.

Sacerdotalism, in the Christian system, can only be the claim to represent Christ. The Bishop of Rome, for instance, is considered to be the embodiment of all sacerdotal pretensions, because he so assumes to represent Christ as to call himself His Vicar. He personally represents Him, even to the extent of claiming infallibility and universal dominion.

All who claim to exercise sacerdotal or priestly functions claim to do so simply because they suppose that when Christ said to the first ministers of the Church,—"As My Father sent Me so send I you. Whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them,"—He meant those ministers to represent Himself by applying to men the merits of that Sacrifice which He had just offered on the Cross. Those who deny these sacerdotal powers must acknowledge—if they believe the New Testament at all—that Christ did, at the first, send some persons to represent Him as His ministers, or ambassadors, or stewards, for some purposes of grace; but

they say that sacerdotalists claim to represent Him unduly, or in ways in which He gave to them no power to represent Him. Now, a very little consideration will be sufficient to convince the reader that every one who consecrates the Eucharistic elements, and administers what he has consecrated, by so doing claims to represent Christ in the most direct way possible.

By the very structure of the office, or service, or Liturgy (whether it be that of the ancient offices or that of the Church of England is, in this respect, all the same *), he must claim to do what he does as being the direct representative of Christ; for, in doing what Christ commanded, he does what Christ did, and he says over the elements the words which Christ Himself said —not rendering the words of Christ in the third person, as if he were reciting a mere narrative, but using the first person: "This is *My* body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of *Me*." †

In saying and doing all this, he does not say and do what he says and does merely in the Name of Christ, but he puts himself so into the place of Christ as to repeat His acts and His words; and surely if men understood this, they would acknowledge that no representation of Christ can exceed, or even reach to, this.

Again, whatever Holy Food he distributes from this altar or table, he must do it as representing Christ, and if for no other reason, for this, that it is undoubtedly the Lord's Table. No man can preside at another man's table, and give food from it to his guests, unless on the

* For Ancient Liturgies see Appendix B.

† The reader will observe how this bears out the theory of the Church that Christ is the one Priest present in every Eucharist; for *He is present* to consecrate by His own words uttered, as if He were *now uttering them*, by the mouth of the representative minister.

assumption that he specially represents the person to whom the table belongs. If it be in very deed the Lord's Table, He must feed us from it; and if the Lord be not visibly present, He must feed us by the hands of those whom He has appointed; just as when He fed the multitudes, He fed them by the hands of the Apostles.

All those who celebrate the Lord's Supper profess to give in it, as Christ's representatives, what He gave. If they believe that He gave emblems only, they profess to give the same. If they believe that He gave something far greater than emblems, they profess to give that Greater Thing which they believe that He gave.

And all branches of the Church Catholic which believe that Christ has left a visible body or organisation, believe that this function of representing Christ at His Altar or Table rests with the ministry of this body or organisation. Those clergymen of the Church of England who, on platforms, declaim against Sacerdotalism and "sacrificing priests," in their own churches rigidly confine the actual celebration (i. e. the reading of the Consecration Prayer, with the accompanying manual acts) to those who are in Priest's orders. I never heard of their inviting the clerk, or the Scripture-reader, or some devout communicant, to "do this."

And yet it is clear that the only protest worth anything against sacerdotalism which such persons can make is a practical protest of this sort. It seems worse than absurd to deny a priesthood in the Christian ministry, and yet to act as if there were a very exclusive one every time you celebrate the characteristic rite of the Gospel.

If it be rejoined that this reservation to fully-

ordained clergymen of the act of celebrating is merely a matter of order in any particular Church, I reply that the act of celebrating must either appertain to the common priesthood of all Christians, or it must be a function of a selected ministry. If it be the common right of all Christians, then no Church has any power to deprive the laity of it, just as no Church has power to deprive the laity of the Cup.

We believe that this reservation to priests of the power of consecrating is in reality a matter of order, because, of course, we cannot believe that God regards a clergyman personally as higher in His favour than a layman; but then we believe that it *is* a matter of order, and that order the order of the Universal Church of Christ, not that of any local Church; and we believe that this "order" dates its origin from the very first celebration, when the Great Institutor, instead of gathering together all those who believed in Him, and giving them a commission to "do this," gave His command to twelve only.

And so it has been ever since. If there be one principle of outward discipline more than another which has been firmly held in all parts of the Church of Christ, it has been this—that only those who have the commission of the second order of the ministry can execute the office of celebrating the Eucharist.

Even those amongst us who stoutly deny all priesthood and all Eucharistic Sacrifice seem instinctively to recognise this.

The Presbyterians in Scotland, or the Wesleyans in England, never allow their elders or their local preachers to preside at the Lord's Supper. I have known instances where the latter have taken some pains, in the *absence of* any minister in full connection, to procure

the services of some one whom they supposed had some claim to ordination.

I confess that I cannot understand such a line taken by bodies who believe that there is no sacrifice more than that which every man can offer by himself, and that there is no distribution except of mere emblems. For what authority or ordination is necessary for the distribution of mere emblems? Emblems require no consecration. They are as emblematical, or instructive, or suggestive before as after consecration.

But we hold the opposite of all this. We hold that the Church, as such, through its appointed ministers, makes a public church memorial or commemoration of a kind which no man can make in the depth of his own heart; which memorial on earth answers to that which Christ is presenting in heaven; and we hold that we receive from God's altar a Divine Food, which bread and wine cannot possibly be in itself, or cannot possibly naturally convey to us, by which Divine Food our union with Christ is further cemented.

Now, we hold that however our own faith may be necessary in order that we may realise this act of memorial as the Representation of the Death of Christ and its blessed connection with the Representation which He is making at the Right Hand of God, yet that it is not our faith which makes the memorial. It only enables us to join, heart and soul, in that which the Church makes. And she makes it in fulfilling the Institution—the outward visible Institution—which Christ has provided and ordained. Holding all this, we cannot but hold that if there be a commission or ordination required to do anything in the Christian religion, it is required for those who "do this."

Are, then, Christian ministers "sacrificing priests"?

"Sacrificing priests" is now a term of opprobrium applied to those who hold that the Eucharist is a memorial before God; but let those who cast it about as a word of reproach remember that those who hold the Eucharistic Sacrifice and those who deny it to be a sacrifice do the same thing—precisely the same thing in respect of sacrifice—assuming, of course, that both are ministers of the Church of England. For both consecrate the same elements, using the same words, and with the same manual acts; they break the bread at a certain time, and take the cup at a certain time afterwards. They receive themselves, and they distribute to others, using words which betoken the Body and Blood of Christ separated in a Sacrificial Death. In doing all this they do what has ever been held by the Church to constitute the anamnesis or memorial which Christ ordained, and this is the Sacrifice.

Not one of the things which the supposed sacrificing priest does over and above the things done by the supposed non-sacrificing clergyman bears the remotest resemblance to the characteristic priestly act of the Levitical, that is, we suppose, the "proper" priest; for his sacerdotal act was the presentation or sprinkling of warm blood just caught from the veins of the creature immolated.

If the clergyman who holds the Eucharistic Sacrifice makes what is considered to be the most extreme expression of sacrificial doctrine by putting on the coloured vestment prescribed (or supposed to be prescribed) in the rubric, by so doing he makes himself more unlike the Levitical or proper priest than the non-sacrificing clergyman who keeps to the use of the white linen surplice, for the sacerdotal act of *the Levitical* priest was the manipulation of blood

which, of course, necessitated the use of a linen vestment.

If the Eucharist be in any sense a Sacrifice, it must be a far better, holier, and more exalted Sacrifice than any so-called "proper" Sacrifice; for the Great High Priest has certainly connected it in a very intimate way with His own Sacrifice; and, if so, then the ordained minister, who makes it as the servant and in the name of the congregation, must be a priest, and a sacrificing priest too; for, without him, the congregation would not make the sacrificial Memorial, and by his means they do make it. Of course, every Christian Priest celebrates simply as the minister and mouthpiece of the congregation. Throughout the whole office (and the same applies to every Liturgy of every branch of the Catholic Church) he speaks in the first person plural on behalf of those present; and from the earliest times, as we have before noticed, the worshippers always respond to the Consecration act itself by a distinct and special "Amen." Thereby declaring the whole to be their act and deed.*

Romanists freely confess all this; and if they did not, their whole service of the Mass would witness against them, for it is said, just as much as ours is said, in the name of the congregation. One great Romish controversialist whom I have already quoted brings this very pro-

* See particularly note on p. 11. In the Liturgy of St. James, representing the earliest type of Liturgy, the congregation first respond "Amen" after the saying of the words of Institution over the bread, then a second "Amen" after the saying of the corresponding words over the cup; then, after the Priest has said "Do this in remembrance of Me," they respond, "O Lord, we show forth Thy Death and confess Thy Resurrection;" and they respond "Amen" after each invocation of the Spirit on the elements. And yet this Liturgy is far more "sacerdotal" than our own.

minently forward. Speaking of the Eucharist as a Sacrifice of Thanksgiving, he says:—

"While the community, in the person of the priest, performeth this, it confesses perpetually what Christ became, and still continues to be, for its sake." Again, a little further on: "The community, however, continually professes itself a sinner, needing forgiveness, and striving ever more and more to appropriate to itself the merits of Christ." Again: "The assembled congregation declares, from what we have stated, that in itself, without Christ, it discovers nothing, absolutely nothing, which can be agreeable to God."—Moehler's 'Symbolism.'

Let the reader remember that I quote these words solely for the purpose of showing that if leading Romanists, whom all allow to be "sacerdotalists," can hold that in the special Eucharistic action the priest is the servant and mouthpiece of the Christian Body, much more may we.

I will conclude this chapter with the words of Dr. Waterland, whom some I see are now dragging forward on the anti-sacrificial side:—

"From hence likewise may we understand in what sense the officiating authorized Ministers perform the office of proper Evangelical Priests in this service. They do it in three ways. 1. As commemorating, in solemn form, the same sacrifice here below which Christ, our High Priest, commemorates above. 2. As handing up (if I may so speak) those prayers and those services of Christians to Christ our Lord, who, as High Priest, recommends the same in heaven to God the Father. 3. As offering up to God all the faithful who are under their care and ministry, and who are sanctified by the Spirit (Rom. xv. 16). In these three ways the Christian officers are Priests or Liturgists to very excellent purposes, far above the legal ones, in a sense worth the contending for, and worth the pursuing with the utmost zeal and assidnity."
—'Waterland on the Eucharist,' chap. xii.

XVII.

THE RITUAL OF THE EUCHARIST.

If the view taken in the preceding pages, respecting the Eucharistic Sacrifice, be according to the truth of God, then it is quite clear that the whole subject lies in a region far higher than that of what is commonly called "Ritual," such as the place of the altar in the church, or its furniture, or the position of the celebrant, or his vestments.

And yet, though the blessed truth that there is in the Eucharist an act of worship, having its heavenly counterpart on the very throne of God, may not be affected by anything which is commonly called "Ritual," yet it must affect, rather it must necessitate, "Ritual" of some sort; for the Eucharist is ordained by Jesus Christ Himself as an outward rite, and a rite of any sort implies a ritual of some sort, and this ritual will necessarily be the expression of men's belief respecting the rite. To take an extreme case. A body of professing Christians, who regard the Holy Communion as a mere memorial meal, on elements which have no consecration and no Inward Part, cannot celebrate it as those would do who regard it as a solemn act of worship, identified with, or most intimately connected with, the One all-sufficient Sacrifice.

Again, a Church which regards it as the grand characteristic act of worship of the Christian religion,

corresponding to the priestly act of our Redeemer in heaven, will be insensibly led to celebrate it differently to a Church which regards it as but one among many acts of worship.

These considerations bear directly upon the two points of ritual which are the principal occasion of our present divisions.

1. The position of the celebrant at the altar or table.

2. The use of a distinctive vestment for the celebrant.

I. In considering the first of these, I shall have to remark that the Eucharist appears from the very first as an act of worship, in which is incorporated, as an inseparable part of it, a partaking of the Elements which have been consecrated in and by the act of worship.

In the earliest Liturgies, for instance, it appears as more exclusively an act of worship than it does in our own, because there are certain short addresses or acts of instruction embodied in our form, which had no existence in the early forms, which are composed from beginning to end of worship only.

But along with this act of worship, and as a part of the whole act, there was ever joined a feeding on the Holy Thing—the prayers and thanksgivings assuming that the Holy Thing over which the prayers are said would be devoutly consumed.

Now in close connection with all this,—in fact, in consequence of it,—the thing at which this act of worship was performed was, in all ages of the Church, called an altar; not because anything was done upon it in the least degree like the things which were done upon an *ancient altar*, but because all the highest worship of

mankind had been performed at altars; and because this altar supported Sacrificial Elements which were consecrated by a Sacrificial Prayer.

All this continued till the time of the Reformation, and in our own Church till after that time. The pre-Reformation rite, whatever its faults, was an act of worship. The first book of Edward VI. was an act of worship, having some hortatory forms incorporated into it, but still an act of worship.

After the publication of the first book a very considerable change was begun upon principles which, as I shall shew, if carried out, would have destroyed the Eucharist itself; though I do not believe for a moment that Bishop Ridley, who has come down to us as inaugurating this change, foresaw this. Through the influence of the foreign Reformers (and actually under protest that the change was needless*), the remains of Catholic ceremonial in the first book were removed, the (supposed) altars were everywhere ordered to be changed into (supposed) tables, simply by changing their material and their place in the church, the devotional element in the first Service Book of Holy Communion was very considerably curtailed,† and, along with the

* The Act of Parliament enacting the use of the second book is incorporated into the book itself; and in the preamble of this Act the book which it supersedes is described as "a very godly order set forth by authority of Parliament for Common Prayer and administration of the Sacrament, to be used in the mother tongue within this Church of England, agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in godly conversation, and most profitable to the state of this realm."

† For instance, the following were omitted: the "Osannah;" the form of thanksgiving and praise, "Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father," &c., which I have quoted in page 109; the form, "Christ our Paschal Lamb is offered up for us once for all;" and the "Agnus Dei."

change of place of the altar, the position of the minister at that altar or table necessarily changed.

Now what was the principle which suggested these changes? In what direction were they tending? There
37 cannot be the smallest doubt, if we look into the services provided for Zurich and Geneva by those on whose advice our Reformers acted. We find that the foreign Reformers, when they had their own way, instituted a service which was so purely a memorial meal that it was in no respect an act of worship. In the service
62 which Calvin provided for Geneva the words and acts of Institution, instead of being embodied in a prayer, were read and expounded. There being no Consecration Prayer, and indeed no prayer at all in the Communion itself, there was naturally no altar, not even a "God's board," for tables were brought in when they were required for the Supper, and then taken out again. Around these the communicants sat when they ate the unconsecrated symbols. Now, however our whole souls may revolt from all this, yet we must remember that it was strictly consistent with the principles of those who ordered it. Calvin categorically asserted that there was no Sacrifice whatsoever in the "Supper."* He even declares that he cannot excuse the Fathers (Justin Martyr, Augustine, &c.) for holding it to be this,† even in a modified sense, and so he most

* "The opinion that the Supper is a Sacrifice derogates from that of Christ, and must therefore be condemned as devilish."—'Calvin's Tracts,' vol. ii., p. 183. (English translation.)

† "It appears that the ancient Fathers called the Supper a sacrifice; but the reason they give is because the death of Christ is represented in it. Hence their view comes to this—that this name is given it merely because it is a memorial of the one Sacrifice, at which we ought entirely to stop. And yet I cannot altogether excuse the custom of the *early Church*. By gestures and modes of acting, they figured a species

effectually excluded all sacrifice by abolishing Consecration altogether. Did, then, our Reformers proceed thus far, or shew even a disposition to do so? Thank God, no. It is true they attempted to conciliate the foreign Protestants by changing, as they thought, the altar into a table by removing it from the east end and altering its material; but they ordained that virtually the same Consecration Prayer should be said over the elements placed upon it, and this was the only act of worship characteristic of the Christian altar. So that, wherever it was placed, it was as much an "altar" as ever. It is true, also, that they abolished all "crossings," "genuflections," and "elevations;" but these things multiplied ten thousand times would not have made the thing done at the altar any nearer to a proper sacrifice.

It is difficult to understand the action of Bishop Ridley in this matter, except on the supposition that he was not a free agent. In his very last examination he expressed himself in very decided terms in favour, not only of a sacrifice of some sort in the Eucharist, but of that sacrificing being an offering of Christ "after an unbloody manner in a mystery;" taking up, in fact, the very words of his Romish opponents.* How he could

---

of sacrifice with a ceremony resembling that which existed under the Old Testament, except that instead of a beast they used bread as the host" (p. 183).

The reader has only to compare any mode of celebrating the Holy Communion in use at any time in any part of the Christian Church with any sacrifice in the Old Testament, and he will acknowledge how impudent this falsehood is; and yet it has constantly been repeated amongst ourselves, and has helped to do its evil work of obscuring a most sacred subject and widening our divisions.

* I shall shew in Appendix D that this offering of Christ in a mystery is the only way conceivable in which He can be offered.

desire to change a service in which he believed that such a sacrifice was inherent, with the view of pleasing those who held that it contained no sacrifice in any sense, seems difficult to understand. However, the Church, which reveres his memory more than that of any of his contemporaries, has slowly and silently, yet absolutely and irrevocably, undone his work in this respect. Tables have been universally restored to their "altar" place at the east end. I suppose that among the almost innumerable churches which his three last successors in the See of London have consecrated, scarcely one is ordered (in the matter of its altar) as the "Injunctions" of their great predecessor require.

But the position of the table naturally rules the position of the celebrant towards the table. The celebrant, when he officiates, does not perform an act of worship at such a thing as a prayer-desk, but at a table. Now from the introduction of Christianity into the island till the publication of the second book of King Edward VI., the altar was at the east end of the church—the people all turned towards it, and the position of the celebrant was the natural one for a person who was performing a solemn act of worship as the representative of the congregation. He stood before them, having his back towards them, because his face was turned in the same direction as their faces were turned. In the latter part of King Edward's reign the place of the altar was changed with a view of making it a table. It was directed to be set in the body of the church, with its ends east and west, and so the position of him who performed the act of worship at it was naturally changed. He was to take the broad side of it, just as he had done before; but this "broad side" *now facing* north, he was directed to take the north

side, and therefore, according to common sense, the most convenient side.*

But this new place of the altar not only did not establish itself permanently in the church, but it absolutely died out, even though it was laid down in the rubrics of each successive Prayer-book to be the first, and so most legal, place of the Holy Table. "The Table" (the rubric of the last revision orders) "shall stand *in the body of the church or* in the chancel," &c. Yet, I suppose, no bishop thinks of requiring, before he consecrates any church, that the altar or table in it should be placed in the strictly legal place, which place and position would alone justify the celebrant, on either historical or common sense grounds, in taking the north end.

It may be asked, How is it that though the place of the altar in the body of the church is, according to the rubric, the preferable one, yet that the Church in her thirteen thousand fabrics has so universally rejected it, that it is out of the power of man to restore it? I answer, simply because the position was essentially a false one, a *suggestio falsi*. The altar was moved from the east end in order that it should no longer be taken to be an altar, whereas virtually the same thing was ordered to be done upon it in its non-altar position, as when it stood at the east end, and so was supposed to be a "proper" altar.

Bread and wine were consecrated upon it by the recitation of the same words of Christ over them. It is

* From all that we can gather from the history of this complicated dispute, there was no doctrinal importance intended at the first to be attached to the position of the celebrant at the altar. It was simply a matter of convenience or propriety. The doctrinal struggle was connected wholly with the place of the altar itself.

not its place, its position, its material, its covering, or its ornaments which can make such a thing an altar; but it is the act performed upon it, and that act was a memorial recital in a prayer over the Elements, the one only sacrificial thing which had ever been done at any Christian altar.

It seems to me, then, that the west side, or rather the broad side, is the natural and proper place for the priest to stand. And it seems especially so in our rite, for in it he has to break the bread "before the people."

I take this to mean that he is to break the bread "before them," as their representative or minister, the whole act being the act of the Church—the Body of Christ. It has been absurdly supposed that "before the people" means that they should be enabled to gaze at the actual fracture; but surely this is contrary to the spirit of that Article which lays down (and very rightly) that the Sacraments of Christ were not ordained to be gazed upon. If he breaks the bread standing in front of the table it must be far more "before the people" than when he does the same act in the north *corner*, hidden in most churches by walls, pillars, desks, or pulpit from half his flock. Such a position cannot reasonably be described as "before the people."

The words of Sir J. T. Coleridge, now, I am thankful to see, constantly quoted, seems to me to suggest the true spiritual, as well as common sense, view of this not unimportant matter:—

"As to the place of standing at the Consecration, my *feeling* is entirely with them [i.e., those who stand at the west side]. It seems to me not desirable to make it essential, or even important, that the people should see the breaking of the bread, or the taking the cup into *the hands* of the priest, and positively mischievous to encourage them

in gazing on him, or watching him, with critical eyes while so employed. I much prefer the spirit of the rubric of 1549, first book of Edward VI., which says, 'These words, before rehearsed, are to be said turning still to the altar, without any elevation or shewing the Sacrament to the people." The use now enforced [by the Purchas judgment] I think tends to deprive the most solemn rite of our religion of one of its most solemn particulars. Surely, whatever school we belong to, and even if we consider the whole rite merely commemorative, it is a very solemn idea to conceive the priest, at the head of his flock, and, as it were, a shepherd leading them on in heart and spirit, imploring for them, and with them, the greatest blessing which man is capable of receiving on earth: he alone uttering the prayer, they meanwhile kneeling all, and in deep silence listening, not gazing, rather with closed eyes, and with their whole undistracted attention, joining in the prayer with one heart and without sound till the united 'Amen' breaks from them at the close, and seals their union and assent."

II. Our other point is—The use of a distinctive vestment for the celebrant.

The principle that it is right and becoming that the minister of God should wear a distinctive dress is practically asserted by every body of Christians in existence, except one or two sects (such as Quakers and Plymouth Brethren), in England and America.

All professing ministers of Christ so dress themselves that when they walk abroad they may appear to be such.

In a large county town, where I was lately an incumbent, there were twelve or thirteen denominations, and the ministers of almost all these bodies were, when walking in the streets, quite as sacerdotal in their garb as the priests of the Church of England.*

So that the common instinct of Christendom has recognized and acted on the principle. When we look to

* The 'Pall Mall Gazette,' in noticing a meeting of Congregationalist ministers, remarked that their predecessors, but a short time ago, dressed like gentlemen—they like priests.

the application we see much diversity, but the following facts are beyond dispute:—

(1.) The Catholic Church, from the very first, has regarded the Eucharist as *the* special Christian religious service.

(2.) The Catholic Church, from the first, has required her ministers to celebrate this rite in a special vestment.

In the oldest form of Liturgy, and that of which, from its having been incorporated into the Apostolic constitutions, we know best the original text, we have a rubric or direction, that at the beginning of the part which contains the actual celebration, the bishop is to put on his splendid vestment,* evidently with the intention of marking that part of the service as one of peculiar solemnity. Now the service in which the minister of Christ is then engaged deserves to be distinguished by some such special mark, for it is the distinctive Christian service. It is the only service of worship which our Lord distinctly commanded. He instituted it at the most solemn time imaginable, and at the latest period of His earthly life in which it was possible for Him to do so. He instituted it, not by merely commanding it, but by doing the thing Himself, and by bidding His disciples to do the same thing which He did. In this respect it stands in strong contrast with Baptism, the other Sacrament which He expressly ordained; for He baptised not, but His disciples; whereas He Himself celebrated the Lord's Supper when He instituted it. In accordance with all this, it is the one service which the New Testament Christians come together on the Lord's day to observe; and in the earliest Christian writer who, in the age immediately succeeding the

* Λαμπρὰν ἐσθῆτα μετενδὺς.

Apostolic, has given us an account of the worship of the Church, it appears as its distinguishing act of worship.

It seems consistent with common sense that, if the Christian minister is to be distinguished from his fellow Christians at any time by any garb of any sort, he should be so distinguished when he is performing this office of his ministry. Still more does it seem consistent with common sense that, if he is required to wear a ministerial vestment, as the surplice, when he is leading the congregation in the singing or saying of psalms and hymns and the ordinary daily prayers, he should have a different vestment to mark the peculiar solemnity of the Eucharistic office. For no Christian, in his senses, would say that the Prayer of Consecration, embodying as it does the words and acts of our Blessed Lord Himself, takes no higher place in our worship than the prayer for the Queen's Majesty, or the prayer for the High Court of Parliament.

Still more than this. In our principal churches we require those lay persons who take the very subordinate part of choristers and lay clerks to wear a distinctive dress, and surely the same principle would lead the Church (as it has done) to adopt (or prefer) a distinctive vestment for one who leads the congregation in performing the act of worship which the religious sense of all Christendom has restricted to ordained men.

So far for the principle of a distinctive vestment for the celebrant. How has this been recognized in our own Church?

Very distinctly, indeed, I answer; for the principle, after being categorically denied in one reformed service book, has been re asserted in two successive revisions of the same book; and this in the face of the fact that

it could not be carried out in practice, so far, that is, as that all celebrants must be compelled to wear the distinctive vestment.

I trust the reader will bear with me whilst I go over the oft-repeated proof.

In the first reformed Office Book, which continued in force till a few months before the death of Edward VI., we have this rubric:—

"Upon the day, and at the time appointed for the ministration of Holy Communion, the Priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a white alb, plain, with a vestment or cope. And when there be many Priests or Deacons there, so many shall be ready to help the Priest in the ministration as shall be requisite. And shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for their office, that is to say, albs with tunicles."

In 1552 a new Prayer Book was published, in which these vestments were forbidden, and the ministers were restricted to a surplice at all times of their ministration; so that the principle that a special vestment was fitting for the celebration of Holy Communion was denied. The new rubric was not at the commencement of the Communion Service, but at the beginning of the book, and was this:—

"And here is to be noted that the minister, at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope; but, being Archbishop or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and, being a Priest or Deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."

This rubric was the law of the land for less than a year, for, in the middle of 1553, Edward VI. died, and with Queen Mary came back the full Romish ceremonial. *At her* death the reformed book was restored, but with *alterations* which indicated that a strong reaction had

set in against the spirit of the changes made in the book of 1552.

In this book (1559) the rubric directing that the surplice alone should be used in all ministrations was exchanged for one which distinctly re-enacted the use of the vestments of the first book. It runs:—

"And here is to be noted that the minister, at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book."

The words of the Act here alluded to as "set in the beginning of this book" are as follows:—

"Provided always, and be it enacted, that such ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use as was in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of King Edward VI., until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the Great Seal of England for causes Ecclesiastical or of the Metropolitan of this realm."

This rubric continued in the Prayer Book as the rule for vestments and ornaments till the last revision in 1662. It was, however, never enforced. The power conferred by it on the sovereign to take other "order" was acted on in the "advertisements" put out by Elizabeth in 1564. They are:—

"Item. In the ministration of the Holy Communion in cathedral and collegiate churches, the principal minister shall use a cope with gospeller and epistler agreeably; and at all other prayers to be said at that communion-table to use no copes, but surplices.

"Item. That the Dean and Prebendaries wear a surplice with a silk hood in the quire; and when they preach in the cathedral or collegiate church, to wear their hood.

"Item. That every minister saying any public prayers, or ministering the sacraments or other public rites of the Church, shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves."

I desire the reader to remark, respecting these orders, that whilst relaxing the stringent order of the rubric, they reassert very strongly the principle that there should be a distinctive vestment for the Holy Communion, and for that alone; for at all other prayers, even at the communion-table, the surplice alone is to be in use.

The same principle is reasserted in the canons of 1604, published (I suppose) with the king's authority by the power given him to "make order" in such matters by the clauses of the Act of 1559, before cited.

The Canons simply re-enact the advertisements:—

"XXIV. *Copes to be worn in Cathedral Churches by those that administer the Communion.*

"In all cathedral and collegiate churches, the Holy Communion shall be administered upon principal feast days sometimes by the Bishop, if he be present, and sometimes by the Dean, and at sometimes by a Canon or Presbyter, the principal minister using a decent cope, and being assisted with the gospeller and epistler agreeably, according to the advertisement, published anno 7 Eliz. . . . .

"XXV. *Surplices and Hoods to be worn in Cathedral Churches when there is no Communion.*

"In the time of Divine Service and prayer, in all cathedral and collegiate churches, when there is no communion, it shall be sufficient to wear surplices, &c.

"LVIII. *Ministers reading Divine Service and administering the Sacraments to wear Surplices, and Graduates therewithal Hoods.*

"Every minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish," &c.

With respect to these canons, I would only remark, in passing, that the words "upon principal feast days" refer *rather* to the persons who in cathedrals should

celebrate on the great feast days, preferably the Bishop, then the Dean, then a Canon or Prebendary. Mr. Beresford Hope has most conclusively shewn by a comparison of the Latin text with the English, that the real object of the canon is not to limit the use of the distinctive vestment to the great festival days, for the advertisements to which they refer require it on all celebrations, but that the days themselves should be marked by the principal minister celebrating upon such days; and, indeed, "*in festis solennibus*" seems to cover all Sundays.

In these canons, then, the principle is re-asserted.

Now, there can be no doubt that during this period (i. e. from 1559 to 1662) vestments were not in general use, the great struggle being for the retaining of the surplice; but the Act of Parliament which re-enacted them, though not enforced, was never repealed; and so we have a man of the eminence of Bishop Williams, then Bishop of Lincoln and Dean of Westminster, suggesting, as chairman of a committee on Religion, numbering among its members a great part of the leading Churchmen of the lower school, this "consideration":—

"Whether the rubric should not be mended, where all vestments in time of Divine Service are now commanded which were in use in the second year of Edward VI."

We now come to the last revision, which enacted the present rubric, which runs thus:—

"And here is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministrations, shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI."

Before making any observations on this rubric, let me ask the reader to notice that it adopts the words of

the Act of Parliament incorporated in the book of 1559; so that, instead of running, "The minister, at the time of the Communion, shall use such ornaments, &c., as were in use," &c., it runs, "such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministrations, shall be retained and be in use as were in," &c. It adopts, *totidem verbis*, the words of the Act of 1559, adding to them the words, "at all times of their ministrations," adopted from the rubric of 1559.

There cannot be the smallest doubt but that this rubric, being part of the new Act of Uniformity, re-enacts something. What does it re-enact?

Does it re-enact the state of things existing between 1564 and 1662—that is, a state in which the rubric requiring vestments was modified by advertisements and canons requiring a cope in cathedrals and the surplice elsewhere? or does it re-enact the state of things before 1552—that is, the state of things of the second year of Edward VI.?

I cannot see that there can be the least doubt but that those who conducted the last revision desired to put on record in the Prayer Book itself that it was the right and becoming thing to have a distinctive vestment for the Eucharist, not merely in cathedrals, but in all places where it is celebrated; for wherever it is administered, it is the same most Holy Rite.

In order to this, they passed over the state of things in which the distinctive vestment was only partially obligatory, and fell back upon the state of things in which it was everywhere obligatory.

If they had desired to re-enact the state of things introduced by the advertisements and confirmed by the canons, why did they not specify the use of this period *in their* rubric, instead of specifying the use of a period

which these advertisements and canons were put forth to modify? And, in doing this, whether they did it of themselves, or were guided by a Higher Power, they did what was true and right; for there is no reason why the Eucharist of a cathedral should be honoured to the (apparent) disparagement of the same rite in the adjacent houses of God.

They did this knowing what they were doing; for, but a year before, their theological opponents, at the Savoy conference, had made this exception to the then rubric:

"Forasmuch as this rubric seemeth to bring back the cope, albe, &c., and other vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer Book, 5 & 6 Edw. VI., and so our reasons alledged against ceremonies under our eighteenth general exception, we desire it may be wholly left out."

And to this the Bishops answered:—

"For the reasons given in our answer to the eighteenth general exception, whither you refer us, we think it fit that the rubric continue as it is."

In accordance with this, they (in substance) deliberately continued the rubric as part and parcel of the law of the Church, though they must have known that there was little probability that, in their day at least, the law would be observed.

A slight alteration in the wording of the new rubric may, as some think, have made it less stringent; but it re-asserts the principle which has ever been held by every branch of the Church Catholic, that if any vestments are to be used by the minister in the public worship of God, there should be one to distinguish that act of worship which alone Christ ordained, by which He is evidently set forth crucified amongst us, and by which we join ourselves to His heavenly act of Intercession on our behalf.

XVIII.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, I shall notice an objection which could not well be met till the whole subject had been opened out.

It may be said that the view of the Eucharistic Presentation or Sacrifice taken in the preceding pages is not asserted in so many words in Scripture. Though the Institution itself, with the words and acts of Christ closely connecting it with His own Sacrifice on the Cross, are given in the Gospel narrative, and the benefits accruing to the faithful receiver are, by anticipation, recounted in the discourse in the Synagogue at Capernaum, and the intent of the Institution as a means of showing forth the Death of Christ, and as a means of renewed union in His Mystical Body, is set forth by St. Paul; yet it is nowhere said in so many words that Christ instituted a means whereby His Church on earth should represent, under earthly forms, that Presentation of Himself which, as our Eternal Priest, He is now making at the Right Hand of God.

Now, it may be replied to this that the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is as much in the word of God as any other doctrine, or dogma, or inference of theologians which is not expressed in the very words of *Scripture*. Take any doctrinal or dogmatic statement

from the works of any Christian writer of any school upon any truth contained in the Bible, and you will find that it is very rarely, if ever, expressed in the words of the Bible, but is an inference or deduction from many statements of Scripture. And, in fact, we gather from the way in which Christian truth is contained in the Bible, that all Christian teaching is intended to be this. The whole truth respecting any one doctrine is not to be found in one place or passage, but we must have the word of God "dwelling in us richly;" we must "compare spiritual things with spiritual," if we would arrive at a just conclusion respecting almost any truth. Apparently to this end the Bible is the least dogmatical, but the most suggestive of books. But then it is suggestive only to those who have a certain faculty to enable them to receive its suggestions; and that faculty, I need hardly say, is 'Faith.' According to the faith which a man brings to the Word of God, will it suggest to him the deep things of God.

Let us take the case of two men: both shall be Christian men; both exercising repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ. One of these sees only in the Bible what bears upon the personal intercourse of each soul with God; that is, he sees nothing in the Bible but individual conversion and individual apprehension of the Atoning Work, and the individual growth and perseverance of one soul here and another there. Such an one not only sees, but is determined to see, nothing else in the Bible; and inasmuch as God has set in His word a vast amount of truth which is not this, and is intended not to be this, but is to be held along with it, such an one cannot receive with any real faith a vast amount of

God's word. If any statement of God's word, no matter how plain, does not suggest conversion or reliance on imputed righteousness, and particularly if it suggests what the world brands as Sacramentalism, or Sacerdotalism, such a man pushes even the Scripture language concerning it aside with ill-concealed impatience; or, what is worse, explains away the plain words of Scripture so that they seem to mean nothing: as if God had said great things and meant small things; as if He had set forth deep mysteries whilst He only meant to teach us commonplace truths.

Now, of all things in religion, such a man cannot understand the worship of the Church. His notion of united worship really is that an individual should unbare or unfold his Christian experience for the edification of others in an address to God. Hence his ideal of true worship is (if he would confess it) really fulfilled, not in the Eucharist, but in the Prayer Meeting. He can hardly, if at all, realize the Eucharistic celebration as worship, though he may admire the language or spirit of some of its accompanying forms. His mind is so full of merely individual edification that he naturally prefers that view of the Memorial which makes it addressed to men—to himself, or to his fellow-believers.

But let us now take the second case we have supposed, which shall be that of a Christian who has been led to see how full the word of God is of the union of Christians in one Body, and that Body the Mystical Body, or Church of Christ, founded not on individual conversion or experience, but on the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of Christ. Such an one is as alive as his brother Christian can be to the need of repentance and faith in each individual Christian, for

he knows that, without these, all truth of any sort is a dead-letter; but by God's blessing, he is alive to the fact that the Scriptures contain other truths besides those which have directly to do with the individual wants of the isolated Christian. These other truths relate to the Church as the Body of Christ, and they lead him to face the fact that the Church is not merely an inward sentiment but an outward organization, having its outward and visible Sacraments of Unity, its ministry of public service, and its united sacrificial worship.

Instead, then, of pushing aside the doctrine of the Sacraments with impatience, he devoutly contemplates it, and endeavours to realize it, and dwells intently upon the Blessed Words in which the Saviour enshrines it; and this leads him to realize the fact that the very worship of the Church is Sacramental. He cannot but be struck by the fact that Christ ordained but one ordinance, and that this ordinance appears both in Scripture and in early writers as the one Ordinance of public worship. He finds, too, that it superseded and took the place of other ordinances, which ordinances had this characteristic in common with it, that they set forth, only in different forms, the Death of Christ. He notices, too, that Christ ordained it at a Sacrificial time, and in terms which, in all other places where they are used, are undoubtedly Sacrificial. What is he to make of all this? Is he to make the least of it or the most of it? He cannot make less of it than by looking upon it as a simple memorial, not differing in kind from any other memorial meal which any mere man might desire his friends to receive in order to keep his memory alive in their minds. But he dare not thus regard it, for by so doing he would seem to regard it as ordered

by man only, and not by "God manifest in the flesh." Every one who has had his eyes opened to see the perfect union of the Godhead and Manhood of Jesus must attach to it—certainly if not blinded by party prejudice, will be in the way of attaching to it—some mysterious connection with Christ's own Sacrifice. Certainly, the words of Christ, as much as possible, identify it with His own Sacrifice. "This is my body which is being given for you." What, then, he asks himself, is the Sacrifice of Christ? It is the Sacrifice of One Who is God and Man. It is the Sacrifice of the Son of God, Who, before He came upon earth, determined to redeem us by becoming our Sacrifice, and Who to this end took upon Him a nature capable of being sacrificed. He will devoutly dwell upon this great Thing of God, and then the truth must force itself upon his mind that the Sacrifice of such a Being, though consummated in time, must exist in power and efficacy in Eternity. This he finds asserted in Scripture, for he reads there that the Lamb was "foreordained before the foundation of the world," and is "slain from the foundation of the world," and on the throne of the Eternal world the Lamb appears "standing as slain."

He looks into the Old Testament, and he finds there a system of worship which all Christians agree to regard as typifying the slaying of the Lamb of God. So that, when the saints of old offered sacrifices, they typically presented before God the Sacrifice of the Son of God, and pleaded it. He cannot but believe that, if it was the design of God to give His Son, all the worship of the Church set forth that design.

This, then, leads him to dwell in devout contemplation on the Sacrifices of the Old Law. He sees that *they* are acts of worship ordained by God for His

then people, and so he must not regard them as mere sermons on Christian experience for us.

Again, he cannot but see that this act of worship did not consist in the slaughter alone. Each sacrifice had its parts or stages. The blood had to be presented for atonement, and the body fed upon in token of atonement. He says to himself, if the all-reconciling Death is called by the same name of sacrifice, it must have its parts as they had. It must be previously offered as they were. It must be consummated in death as they were. It must be presented as they were. It must be fed upon as they were.

All this he finds to agree with the deepest truths of our religion, that Christ is an Eternal Priest, and that He evermore gives Himself as the Sacrificial food of His people. For, if the Sacrifice of Christ is to be presented, by Whom is it to be presented? It can only be presented by Himself: such a sacrifice, too, must be presented in the highest and holiest place of the universe; and He ascended into heaven that He might *present* it as *One Present* for ever on the throne of God. But is it to be presented by His people on earth, for they are not yet in heaven? It would seem that it must, if the worship of earth is to correspond to the worship of our great High Priest in heaven. And the worship of heaven consists in an unspeakably mysterious exhibition of His Sacrificial Death. And, besides this, the Sacrifice can, as far as we know, be only partaken of on earth. By what means, then, can we, His Church, present, and partake of, the Sacrificial Victim?

Here, then, is a place for the Eucharist—a place answering to the terms in which Christ ordained it in evident identification with His own Sacrifice, and also answering to the whole nature of the dispensation as

no longer a typical dispensation, inasmuch as types and shadows "had their ending" with the bringing in of the realities which they dimly prefigured.

Christ is now setting forth His Death in heaven, for He stands on the throne of God bearing in His living Body the marks of His Suffering Death. And by His command we set forth the same Death on earth in a rite representing His Body and Blood separated in Death. Are these two "settings forth" in combination? Does the one answer to the other? It certainly seems so to do.

The only difficulty arises from unbelief. It seems difficult to believe that the worship of the Church is so great, so awful, and yet so blessed in having such a Divine and heavenly Counterpart. But why should this be hard to receive? It is surely in accordance with the deep mysteries of a dispensation which begins with the advent of God Himself manifest in the flesh, which proceeds to set forth that God has made in, and through, that Body of His Flesh, a sacrifice for all sin, and in that Body has ascended into heaven, and there, as our High Priest, mediates for us in that Body, yet bearing the marks of His Sacrificial Death; and, though in heaven, He is yet with us alway, and we whilst on earth are so in Him that we are "bone of His bone, and flesh of His flesh," and our very life is "hid with Him in God."

APPENDIX A.

TESTIMONY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITERS TO THE DOCTRINE OF A SACRIFICE IN THE EUCHARIST.

CLEMENT, A.D. 80 or 90:

Clement, the companion of Apostles, thus speaks of the worship of Christians:—

"These things being manifest to us, and looking deep into the depths of Divine knowledge, we ought to do all things in order whatsoever the Lord has commanded us to perform at stated times. [He has enjoined] the Oblations and Liturgies to be celebrated (Τάς τε προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι), and that they should not take place at random, or disorderly, but at definite times and hours. When and by whom they should be celebrated He has fixed by His own supreme will, in order that all things, being holily done according to His good pleasure, may be acceptable unto Him. They, then, who at the appointed times make their oblations (ποιοῦντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν) are accepted and blessed; for following the laws of the Lord they sin not. For his own peculiar services (λειτουργίαι, liturgies) are assigned to the High Priest, and to the priests their own proper place has been assigned, and on the Levites their own special ministrations are incumbent."—1st Epistle to Corinth. (ch. 40). Again: "Our sin will not be small if we eject from the Episcopate those who have blamelessly and holily offered the gifts" (προσενεγκόντας τὰ δῶρα). (ch. 44.)

No person would have thus expressed himself respecting the public service of the Church, unless he had regarded it as sacrificial.

IGNATIUS, A.D. 100:

Ignatius, speaking of the Eucharist, presupposes an altar:—

"Take ye heed, then, to have but one Eucharist, for there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for the unity (εἰς

ἕνωσιν) of His Blood, *one altar*, as there is one Bishop, along with the Presbytery and Deacons, my fellow-servants, that so whatever ye do, ye may do it according to the will of God."—Epistle to Philadelphians, iv.

JUSTIN MARTYR, A.D. 133–165:

I have given an extract on page 19. I add another:—

"Accordingly God, anticipating all the Sacrifices which we offer through this Name, and which Jesus the Christ enjoined us to offer, i.e., in the Eucharist of the bread and the cup, and which are presented by Christians in all places throughout the world, bears witness that they are well pleasing unto Him. But He utterly rejects those presented by you, and by those priests of yours, saying, 'And I will not accept your Sacrifices at your hands, for from the rising of the sun to its setting my name is glorified among the Gentiles' [He says], 'but ye profane it.' Yet even now, in your love of contention, you assert that God does not accept the Sacrifices of those who dwelt then in Jerusalem, and were called Israelites; but says that He is pleased with the prayers of the individuals of that nation then dispersed, and calls their prayers 'Sacrifices.' Now that prayers and giving of thanks, when offered by worthy men, are the only perfect and well-pleasing Sacrifices to God, I also admit. For such alone Christians have undertaken to offer, and in the remembrance effected by their solid and liquid food (καὶ ἐν ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς) whereby the suffering of the Son of God which He endured is brought to mind."—Dialogue with Trypho., ch. cxvii.

Now, I desire to draw particular attention to this passage from Justin, because it effectually explains a difficulty which some have made respecting the Eucharistic Sacrifice from the apparently antagonistic expressions of some Fathers respecting "Sacrifice" and "prayer."

We have one early Christian writer after another speaking most unmistakeably of the Eucharist as the Christian Sacrifice, and we have the same writer speaking of prayer and giving of thanks as the only Sacrifice offered by Christians. The passage from Justin is one in point.

It is supposed by some that the writers in question desired to contrast "prayer" and "praise" with the Eucharist, to the depreciation of the latter as a true Sacrifice; as if any conception could be formed of an Eucharist without prayer and praise: for the characteristic of the Eucharist as distinguished from heathen sacrifices (and, indeed, from Jewish

Sacrifices as they appear in the only inspired Jewish Ritual), is the prayer and thanksgiving which are essential to it. As the words of Consecration invariably formed part of a thanksgiving prayer, it could not be consecrated, i.e. the Sacrifice could not be offered, without prayer; indeed, prayer and praise in the Eucharist correspond to the slaying and burning in the heathen rites. The heathen could have formed no conception of such a Sacrifice as the Eucharist, because they had no spiritual conception of Sacrifice or of anything else. They could only conceive of a Sacrifice as something burnt, and so Justin, in a similar passage in his first Apology, reproves them for considering that it is honourable to God to "consume by fire what he has brought into being for our sustenance" (chap. xiii.).

Add to all this, the undoubted fact that the prayers and praises of the Lord's Day, instead of being offered up at services like our Matins and Evensong, formed part of the Eucharistic Liturgy, and the solution of this supposed difficulty is complete.

IRENÆUS, A.D. 180 or 190:

"Again, giving direction to His disciples to offer to God the first-fruits of His own created things—not as if He needed them, but that they themselves might be neither unfruitful nor ungrateful—He took that created thing, bread, and gave thanks, and said, 'This is my Body;' and the cup likewise, which is part of that creation to which we belong, He confessed to be His Blood, and taught the new Oblation of the New Covenant; which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offers to God throughout all the world, to Him who gives us as the means of subsistence the first fruits of His own gifts, concerning which Malachi, among the twelve prophets, thus spoke beforehand: 'I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord Omnipotent,' &c. (quoting Malachi i. 10, 11).

"The oblation of the Church, therefore, which the Lord gave instructions to be offered throughout all the world is accounted with God a pure Sacrifice, and is acceptable to Him."—Irenæus against Heresies, book iv. ch. xvii. 5; xviii. 1.

TERTULLIAN, A.D. 200:

"In like manner, also, most think that on the days of Stations (Wednesdays and Fridays) they ought not to attend the prayers at the Sacrifices, because when the Body of the Lord hath been received, the Station must be broken up. Doth, then, the Eucharist break up a service devoted to God? Doth it not the more bind to

God? Will not thy Station be the more solemn, if thou standest also at the altar of God? When the Body of the Lord hath been received and reserved, both are secured, both the participation of the Sacrifice and the fulfilment of the service."—De Orat. xix.

HIPPOLYTUS, A.D. 220:

"And she [Wisdom] prepared her Table, the knowledge of the Holy Trinity promised, and His precious and pure Body and Blood, which daily at the Mystical and Divine Table are consecrated, being sacrificed in remembrance of that ever-to-be-remembered and first Table of the Divine and Mystical Supper."—On Proverbs ix. 1.

ORIGEN, A.D. 230:

"For this reason, then, let Celsus, as one who knows not God, give thank-offerings to demons; but we who, rendering thanks to the Creator of the Universe, eat the Bread offered with thanksgiving and prayer over the things offered (*τοὺς μετ' εὐχαριστίας καὶ εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθεῖσι προσαγομένους ἄρτους ἐσθίομεν*), and this bread becomes by prayer a certain Holy Body, which sanctifies those who sincerely partake of it. Celsus would also have us to offer first-fruits to demons; but we would offer them to Him Who said, 'Let the earth bring forth grass,' &c., and to Him to Whom we offer first-fruits, we also send up our prayers, &c."—Origen against Celsus, viii. 33, 34.

CYPRIAN, A.D. 250:

"For if Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is Himself the Chief Priest of God the Father, and has first offered up Himself a Sacrifice to the Father, and has commanded this to be done in commemoration of Himself, certainly that Priest truly discharges the office of Christ, who imitates that which Christ did; and he then offers a true and full Sacrifice in the Church to God the Father, when he proceeds to offer it according to what he sees Christ Himself to have offered."

"And because we make mention of His Passion in all Sacrifices (for the Lord's Passion is the Sacrifice which we offer) we ought to do nothing else than what He did. For Scripture saith, 'For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the Lord's Death till He come.' As often, therefore, as we offer the cup in commemoration of the Lord and of His Passion, let us do what it is known the Lord did."—Epistle lxii. To Cæcilius, pp. 218 and 219, in Clark's Series.

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, A.D. 350:

"Then having sanctified ourselves by these spiritual hymns, we call upon the merciful God to send forth His Holy Spirit upon *the gifts lying* before Him; that He may make the bread the Body *of Christ*, and the wine the Blood of Christ; for whatsoever the

Holy Ghost has touched is sanctified and changed. Then, after the Spiritual Sacrifice is completed, the bloodless Service upon that Sacrifice of Propitiation, we entreat God for the common peace of the Church," &c.—Catechetical Lectures, xxiii. Oxford Translation, p. 275.

AMBROSE. (See page 83.)

JEROME:

"In that he says, 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec,' our mystery is signified under the word 'order,' not in sacrificing irrational animals through the order of Aaron, but by the offering bread and wine, that is, the Body and Blood of the Lord Jesus."—Quæst. Hebr. in Gen. xiv. 18.

AUGUSTINE:

An immense number of places might be quoted from the writings of this holy Bishop and Doctor:—

"To be made a partaker of that Table is to begin to have life; for in Ecclesiastes, 'It is not good for a man save that he should eat and drink,' what can he be more probably thought to mean, than what appertains to the participation of this Table, which the Priest Himself, the Mediator of the New Testament, exhibits after the order of Melchizedec, of His own Body and Blood? For this Sacrifice succeeded all those sacrifices of the Old Testament, which were immolated as a shadow of that to come, of which we understand that Voice of the same Mediator speaking through the Prophesy in the 39th Psalm, 'Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a Body hast Thou prepared me;' because for all those sacrifices and oblations His Body is offered, and is ministered to the communicants."—De Civ. Dei, xvii. 20.

"'I will offer my vows unto the Lord in the sight of them that fear Him.' The Sacrifice of peace, the Sacrifice of love, the Sacrifice of His Body the faithful know."—In Ps. xxii. Ex. 2, v. 28.

"Being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross, that so from His Cross might be commended unto us the Body and Blood of the Lord, for a new Sacrifice."—In Ps. xxxiii. (xxxiv. Eng.).

CHRYSOSTOM:

An immense number of places might be gathered out of the writings of this Father. I give one or two only:—

"When he standeth by this Holy Table, when he is about to offer that dread Sacrifice (the initiated know what I mean), he does not touch the Elements until he has first invoked on you the grace from the Lord, and ye have responded to him, 'and with thy

Spirit,' reminding yourselves by this very answer that he that is present doth nothing, nor are the gifts that lie before us any doings of human nature; but the grace of the Spirit being present, and lighting upon all, accomplisheth that mystic Sacrifice. For although it be man who is present, yet it is God Who worketh through him. Do not, then, attend to the nature of what is seen, but consider the invisible Grace. Nought is human of what is done on this Holy Altar."—De S. Pentec. Hom. 1, § 4.

"Here He hath transferred the sacred office to that which is far more awful and glorious, changing the very Sacrifice itself, and instead of the slaughter of irrational creatures, commanding to offer up Himself."—Hom. on 1 Cor. x. 16.

"Think with thyself, O man, what Sacrifice thou art about to touch, what table to approach."—In Diem Nat. J.C. § 7.

See also particularly extract in page 74.

APPENDIX B.

I SHALL now give testimonies from the most ancient liturgical forms to the Sacrifice in the Eucharist.

I shall give in each case that part of the Liturgy in which the sacrificial memorial of the Lord's Death is made—that part which in each particular rite sets forth and presents, by means of the Elements, the Sacrificial Death, and in which alone, if there be anything which can "properly" or "improperly" be called a sacrifice, it must consist.

I earnestly desire the reader to notice four things in which these memorial or sacrificial acts agree:—

1. In each case a real sacrifice is supposed to be made by thanksgiving and prayer over the Elements.

2. This prayer always contains the recital of the words and acts of our Lord at the original Institution.

3. In each case the assembled worshippers take part in the Eucharistic action by response.

4. There is not the slightest resemblance in any of these sacrificial prayers or actions to what is now called a "proper" sacrifice.

THE CLEMENTINE:

"Calling therefore to remembrance those things which He endured for our sakes, we give thanks unto Thee, O God Almighty, not as we ought, but as we are able, and fulfil His Institution. For in the same night that He was betrayed, taking bread into His holy and immaculate hands, and looking up to Thee, His God and Father, and breaking it, He gave it to His disciples, saying, This is the mystery of the New Testament; take of it; eat. This is My Body, which is broken for many for the remission of sins. Likewise, also, having mingled the cup with wine

and water, and blessed it, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; This is My Blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins; Do this in remembrance of Me; For as often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do shew forth My Death till I come.

"Wherefore, having in remembrance His Passion, Death, and Resurrection from the dead, His return into Heaven, and His future second appearance, when He shall come with glory and power to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works; WE OFFER to Thee, our King and our God, according to His Institution, this Bread and this Cup, giving thanks to Thee through Him, that Thou hast thought us worthy to stand before Thee, and to sacrifice unto Thee; and we beseech Thee that Thou wilt look graciously on these gifts now lying before Thee, O Thou all-sufficient God, and accept them to the honour of Thy Christ; and send down Thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the Sufferings of the Lord Jesus, on this Sacrifice, that He may make this Bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of Thy Christ, that all who shall partake of it may be confirmed in Godliness, may receive remission of their sins, may be delivered from the devil and his wiles, may be filled with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of Thy Christ, and may obtain everlasting life, Thou, O Lord Almighty, being reconciled unto them."

This is the whole Sacrificial Prayer; but immediately following this is a Prayer of Intercession (answering to our Prayer for Christ's Church Militant), too long to transcribe. Throughout this prayer we have the words "pray," "call upon," and "offer," used interchangeably, evidently meaning the same as "plead," as—"We pray unto Thee, O Lord, for Thy Holy Church;" "We call upon Thee, O Lord, for the King and all in authority;" "We offer to Thee for all the Saints;" "We further offer to Thee for this people;" "We pray unto Thee for the Catechumens;" "We offer to Thee for seasonable weather." And all this ends with that solemn "Amen" mentioned in 1 Corinth. xiv., and by Justin Martyr, the response by which the lay people claim the whole action as their own.

ST. JAMES:

"When the hour was come that He Who had no sin, was to suffer a voluntary and life-giving Death upon the Cross for us sinners, in the same night that He was offered, or rather offered up Himself for the life and salvation of the world:

Then the Priest taking the bread into his hands: Taking bread *into His* holy, immaculate, pure, and immortal Hands, looking up

to Heaven, and presenting it unto Thee, His God and Father, He gave thanks, sanctified, and brake it, and gave it to His disciples and apostles, saying:

The Deacons say: For the remission of sins, and for life everlasting.

Then he says with a loud voice: Take, eat; this is My Body, which is broken and given for you for the remission of sins.

The People: Amen.

Then he takes the cup, and says: Likewise after supper He took the cup and mixed it with wine and water, and looking up to Heaven, and presenting it to Thee, His God and Father, He gave thanks, sanctified and blessed it, and filled it with the Holy Ghost, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Drink ye all of this. This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed and given for you and for many for the remission of sins.

The People: Amen.

The Priest: Do this in remembrance of me. For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the Death of the Son of Man, and confess His Resurrection until His coming again.

The People: O Lord, we shew forth Thy Death, and confess Thy Resurrection.

The Priest: Wherefore, having in remembrance His life-giving Passion, salutary Cross, Death, Burial, and Resurrection on the third day from the dead; His Ascension into Heaven, and sitting at the Right Hand of Thee, His God and Father; and His second bright and terrible Appearance, when He shall come with glory to judge the living and the dead, and shall render to every man according to his works; we sinners offer to Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice,* beseeching Thee not to deal with us after our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities; but according to Thy clemency and unspeakable love to mankind, overlook and blot out the handwriting that is against us Thy servants, and grant us Thine heavenly and eternal rewards, such as eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man, even such as Thou hast prepared for them that love Thee."

After this there come some ejaculations and responses, like our Kyries, then a prayer for the sanctification of the Elements by the Holy Spirit, and then a long intercessory prayer, beginning with "We offer to Thee, O Lord, for Thy Holy Places," and then a large number of petitions for the clergy, for travellers, for the sick, each one beginning with

* How could such a phrase have been used unless the Church which used it believed that there was some unutterably mysterious connection between what was going on on earth and what was going on at the Right Hand of God? If they had considered the Eucharistic Sacrifice to be a mere memorial akin to any other memorial performed with mere emblems, such a phrase would have been preposterous.

"Remember, O Lord," and the prayer ends with "We offer, also, for the peace and tranquillity of the whole world."

ST. MARK:

The Priest signs the Holy Elements with the sign of the Cross, saying: Heaven and earth are indeed full of Thy glory, by the manifestation of our Lord, our God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ: sanctify, also, O God, this Sacrifice with Thy heavenly Benediction, by the descent of Thy Holy Spirit upon it. For our Lord Himself, our God and supreme King, Jesus Christ, in the same night wherein He delivered Himself for our sins, and was about to suffer death for mankind, sitting down to supper with His disciples, He took bread in His holy, spotless, and undefiled Hands, and looking up to Thee, His Father, but our God and the God of all, He gave thanks, He blessed, He sanctified and brake it and gave it to them, saying (*exalting his voice*), Take, eat.

The Deacons: Attend.

The Priest, with a loud voice: For this is My Body, which is broken and given for the remission of sins.

The People: Amen.

The Priest praying, says: In like manner He took the cup, after supper, and mixing it with wine and water, and looking up to heaven, to Thee, His Father, but our God, and the God of all, He gave thanks, He blessed, He filled it with the Holy Ghost, and gave it to His holy and blessed disciples, saying (*exalting his voice*), Drink ye all of this.

The Deacons: Attend again.

The Priest, with a loud voice: For this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed and given for you, and for many, for the remission of sins.

The People: Amen.

The Priest goes on, praying thus: Do this in remembrance of Me; for as often as ye shall eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye shew forth My Death, and confess My Resurrection and Ascension, till My coming again. Shewing forth, therefore, O Lord Almighty, Heavenly King, the Death of Thine only begotten Son, our Lord, our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and confessing His blessed Resurrection from the dead on the third day, His Ascension into Heaven, and His Session at the Right Hand of Thee, His God and Father; and also looking for His second terrible and dreadful Appearance, when He shall come in righteousness to judge both the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works; we, O Lord God, have set before Thee Thine own, out of Thine own gifts.

After this comes a prayer for the descent of the Holy *Spirit,* but there is no further sacrificial allusion in this *Liturgy.*

The Roman Liturgical Sacrificial Act I have given in page 132.

I have given these extracts from the translation of Dr. Brett. The translation by Dr. Neale differs in no important respect. These represent the most ancient forms of prayer used in the Christian Church. However widely they may differ in other matters, yet in the four which I have alluded to at the beginning of this Appendix they are all agreed. In addition to the three from which I have given extracts, the reader will find in Dr. Brett's collection of Primitive Liturgies the Liturgies of St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, The Ethiopian form, and the Liturgies of the heretical Bishops, Nestorius and Severus. In all these the sacrificial or memorial action is virtually the same.

APPENDIX C.

TESTIMONY OF CATHOLIC WRITERS OF ALL SCHOOLS TO THEIR BELIEF IN THE ALL-SUFFICIENCY OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

THOSE who deny the Eucharistic Sacrifice continually assert respecting those who hold it, that they (the holders of sacrifice) cannot maintain it, and also teach with equal clearness and decisiveness the oneness and all-sufficiency of the Sacrifice of Christ—that that Sacrifice once consummated cannot be reiterated, inasmuch as it was once for all immolated, and cannot be supplemented, for it was infinite in value.

I find that, notwithstanding the repeated assertions of the upholders of Eucharistic Sacrifice, that they hold all this in its integrity, and show they can hold it by proving that the completed and all-sufficient Sacrifice must be presented, and is presented by Christ Himself in Heaven, and that in the Eucharist the Church represents this in the Lord's ordained way: I find, I say, that, notwithstanding this, the deniers of the Eucharistic Sacrifice continue to repeat the absurd and odious charge, or at least to insinuate it.

In order to set this matter at rest in the mind of the reader, I shall let various writers on the sacrificial side speak for themselves, and I shall take the testimony of those who are accounted to be extreme men (not that those who are accounted to be such are really so), and I shall take the assertions of Roman Catholic writers as well as Anglican, and this because it is supposed that the holding of a sacrifice in the Eucharist has a tendency to lead to the denial of

the Sacrifice of Christ as all-sufficient. It is well, then, to shew that those in whom this supposed *tendency* has reached its limit assert as strongly as men can do that the satisfaction made upon the Cross was infinite in value; and though they may, and do, err in other respects, yet this, thanks be to God, they assert.*

Anglo-Catholic writers of the seventeenth century:—

ARCHBISHOP LAUD:

"As Christ offered Himself up once for all, a full and all-sufficient Sacrifice for the sin of the whole world, so did He institute and command a memory of this Sacrifice in a Sacrament, even till His coming again."—Conference with Fisher.

BISHOP COSIN:

"That Thou not weighing our merits, but looking upon the blessed Sacrifice of our Saviour, which was once fully and perfectly made for us all, mayest pardon our offences," &c.—From a prayer before the Sacrament.

HEYLYN:

"For when our blessed Lord and Saviour had, by that one Offering of Himself, once for all, 'perfected for ever all them that are sanctified,' and 'by His own Blood entered into the holy place,' and 'obtained eternal redemption for us,' there was forthwith an end of all those sacrifices in the law by which this one of His had been prefigured."—Antidotum Lincolniense.

THORNDIKE:

"But, for the same reason, and by the same correspondence between the Sacrifices of the law and that of Christ's Cross, it may be evident, that it is not, nor can be, any disparagement to the Sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross, to the full and perfect satisfaction and propitiation for the sins of the world which it hath made, that the Eucharist should be counted the sacrifice of Christ crucified, mystically and as in a Sacrament, represented to, and feasted upon by His people."—Epilogue, Book iii., ch. v.

JEREMY TAYLOR:

"This the Son of God, Jesus Christ, God and Man, undertook, and finished by a sacrifice of Himself upon the altar of the Cross.

* It will of course be understood that I am not committed to the opinions of the writers I have quoted, or to their way of expressing them. This applies particularly to the extracts from Romanists.

This sacrifice, because it was perfect, could be but one, and that once."—Holy Living, sec. x. ch. 4 (before quoted).

JOHNSON:

"'Tis agreed on all hands, that the merit and satisfaction, whereby our sins are forgiven, flow freely from the Grand Sacrifice; but I am now speaking of the actual application of these merits and this satisfaction, which was the end for which all sacrifices under the law, and the Eucharistical Sacrifice under the Gospel, were appointed by God."—Unbloody Sacrifice.

Anglo-Catholic writers of the present century:—

DR. PUSEY:

"In one word did Our Blessed Lord upon the Cross sum up the whole of man's salvation, and His own eternal purpose for our Redemption, 'It is finished.'

"In one human word, did our Lord gather into one all which He had willed, and wrought, and suffered for man's salvation? 'Finished' was the determinate counsel of God; 'finished,' all that prophecy had foretold and type foreshadowed, and patriarchs and righteous men had longed to see, and Angels desired to look into; 'finished,' the work which His Father gave Him to do, and the deliverance He had wrought in the midst of the earth; 'finished' were all the sufferings which the malice of man or of Satan could inflict, and the cup of His Father's wrath; 'finished' the 'transgression,' and 'an end made of sin;' 'finished' the One Sacrifice for sin, the Mortal Life of God made Man, the victory over Satan, his rule and our enthralment."—Sermons, vol. i., Sermon i, p. 1.

DR. NEWMAN (whilst in communion with the Church of England):

"This being the great mystery of Christ's Cross and Passion, we might with reason suppose, as I have said, that some great thing would result from it. The Sufferings and Death of the Incarnate Word could not pass away like a dream; they could not be a mere martyrdom, or a mere display or figure of something else, they must have a virtue in them. This we might be sure of, though nothing had been told us about the result. But that result is also revealed. It is this—our reconciliation to God, the expiation of our sins, and our new creation in holiness. . . . This is why He 'humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the Death of the Cross.' 'Christ hath redeemed us,' saith the apostle elsewhere, 'from the curse of the law being made a curse for us.' *Again*, he says that 'Christ has made peace through the Blood of *His Cross*; He has reconciled us in the Body of His Flesh through *Death*,'" &c.—Parochial Sermons, vol. vi., Sermon vi.

MR. KEBLE:

"This memorial Christ offers in Heaven, night and day, to God the Father: His glorified Body, with all its wounds, His Blood which He poured out upon the Cross, but on His Resurrection took again to Himself, and with it ascended into Heaven. With that Body and Blood He appears continually before the Throne, by it making intercession for us; by it reminding God the Father of His One Oblation of Himself, once offered upon the Cross, as St. John writes, 'We have an Advocate,' one to plead for us 'with the Father, and He is the Propitiation for our sins.' Thus He is our Aaron first and then our Melchizedec, the virtue of His perpetual Advocacy depending on His former propitiation."—Eucharistic Adoration.

DR. MANNING:

"The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, then, is One. There is no other like it, or second after it. It is not the highest of a kind, or the perfecting of any order of oblations; but, like His Person, a mystery sole and apart, &c. From the great day of Atonement till now, all the elect of God have been made perfect through the continuous power of that one oblation, made once for all. . . . Now this leads to two high and blessed truths, revealed to us for our endless consolation The first is that the Holy Eucharist is a true and real Sacrifice. Can it be necessary to say, that when the Sacrament upon the altar is called a sacrifice, it does not mean a sacrifice added to the Sacrifice on the Cross? That would be to contradict alike all revelation and all reason; to make not one only Sacrifice, but many. . . . Let such a thought, then, be at once and for ever cast aside. Nothing can be added to that which is already perfect. Neither, again, is the Eucharist a sacrifice separate from the Sacrifice on the Cross; for what sacrifice but that alone can 'take away sin'? No acts or offerings of men, any more than the blood of bulls and goats, can take away sin. Faith and adoration cannot; for they need an atonement to be themselves accepted at all. No creature, no universe of creatures, even deathless and sinless, could atone for one sin. Therefore, neither as added to, nor as separate from, the Sacrifice of Christ, is the Holy Eucharist a sacrifice."—Sermons, vol. iv., Sermon xii.

DR. NEALE. (See p. 86.)

Roman Catholic writers:—

CATECHISM OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT:

"The pastor will teach that all these most great and Divine blessings come to us from the Passion of the Lord: first, because the Satisfaction which Jesus Christ has, in an admirable manner, made unto His Eternal Father for our sins, is full and complete: and the price which He has paid for our ransom not only equals

and quits, but far exceeds our debt. Furthermore, it was a sacrifice most acceptable to God which, when offered by His Son on the altar of the Cross, entirely appeased the wrath and indignation of the Father.—Part i., chap. iii., quest. xv.

BISHOP GARDINER. (See p. 85.)

HARDING (BISHOP JEWEL'S opponent):

"The virtue of Christ's Death and Passion is grace and remission of sins, the appeasing of God's wrath, the reconciliation of us to God, deliverance from the Devil, hell, and everlasting damnation. Our adversaries, imputing to us as though we said or taught that the priest applieth this virtue, effect, and merit of Christ's Death to any man by means of the Mass, either belie us of ignorance, or slander us of malice. Verily we say, Not so. Neither doth the priest apply the virtue of Christ's Passion to any man by the means of the Mass. He doth but apply his prayer and his intent of oblation, beseeching Almighty God to apply the virtue and merit of His Son's Death (the memory whereof he celebrateth at the Mass) to them for whom he prayeth. It is God, and none other, that applieth to us remission of sins; the priest doth but pray for it, and by the commemoration of His Son's Death, moveth Him to apply."—Parker Society, 'Works of Jewel,' second portion, p. 746.

'Garden of the Soul' (BISHOP CHALLONER):

"Accordingly, our Saviour Jesus Christ, at the time appointed by His Father, having taken flesh for us, was pleased to offer Himself a Sacrifice for us all, dying upon the Cross for the sins of the whole world. By this one offering we were completely redeemed, inasmuch as our ransom was paid, and all mercy, grace, and salvation were purchased for us. Neither can there be now any need of His dying any more, or purchasing any other graces for us than those for which He has already paid the price of His Blood."—Page 55.

'DEHARBE'S Catechism' (published by authority):

"Why was it the will of Christ to suffer and die?—In order to satisfy the Divine Justice for our sins, and thereby to redeem and save us.

"By His voluntary obedience unto the Death of the Cross, Christ has given full, nay, superabundant satisfaction to the Divine Majesty for the manifold offences given to Him by our disobedience, &c.

"For what sins has Christ given satisfaction?—For the sins of the whole world.

"Why is the satisfaction of Christ of infinite value?—It is of infinite value, because a Divine Person made it; for the greater *the dignity of* the Person who satisfies, the greater also is the value *and merit of* the satisfaction.

"What more has Christ gained for us through His sufferings and Death?—He has (1) Reconciled us to God; (2) Re-opened heaven to us; and (3) Merited abundant grace for us, in order to enable us to lead a holy life, and to obtain eternal happiness."—'On the Creed. Suffered under Pontius Pilate.'

MOEHLER:

"After this exposition, we are probably now enabled to give a satisfactory solution to the chief objection which the Protestant communities have urged against the Catholic Sacrifice of the Mass. It is argued that by the Mass the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross is abolished, or that, at any rate, it receives a detriment, since the latter is considered as incomplete, and needing a supplement. Now it is self-evident that the Sacrifice of the Mass, by keeping the oblation of Christ on the Cross, or rather His whole Ministry and Sufferings, eternally present, presupposes the same, and in its whole purport maintains the same; and so far from obliterating, it stamps them more vividly on the minds of men, and, instead of supplying the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross with some heterogeneous element, it brings that Sacrifice in its true integrity and original vitality to bear the most individual application and appropriation throughout all ages.'—Chap. iv., p. 238 of Translation.

APPENDIX D.

PROTESTANT WRITERS WHO HAVE HELD THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

BISHOP RIDLEY:

"As though our unbloody Sacrifice of the Church were any other than the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a shewing forth, and a sacramental representation of that one only bloody Sacrifice, offered up once for all."—Ridley's Works (Parker Society), p. 210.

"*Pie.:* What say you to that Council where it is said that the priest doth offer an unbloody Sacrifice of the Body of Christ?

"*Ridley:* I say it is well said, if it be rightly understood.

"*Pie.:* But he offereth an unbloody Sacrifice.

"*Ridley:* It is called unbloody, and is offered after a certain manner, AND IN A MYSTERY, and as a representation of that unbloody Sacrifice: and he doth not lie who saith Christ to be (so) offered.—Ridley's Works (Parker Society), p. 250.

I trust to be forgiven if I make a few remarks on the foregoing words of him whom all account to be the greatest of the Reformers.

If the doctrine contained in these extracts be according to the mind of God, then it must be of supreme importance to every Christian man to realise it every time he comes to the Sacrament. Consider what it is to offer and present Christ in any way which is acceptable to God the Father. If we can offer Christ "in a mystery," then it must be of supreme importance that we should so offer Christ "in mystery," and that we should, as far as possible, realise what we are doing when we so offer Him. The in*finite greatness* of the all-atoning Sacrifice must impart of *its greatness* to every means of representing it before God.

So that if in any way we can offer Christ, it is incumbent on us to do all that lies in our power to enter into and humbly and devoutly realise such an offering.

Now, I cannot see how we can do this if our minds dwell rather on the ways in which He is not offered in the Eucharist, rather than on the way in which He is. If He can be offered in the Eucharist at all, that must be the first thing which the devout Christian teacher will insist upon, and the guarding of this truth against exaggeration must, in the eye of faith, be secondary.

Now, how can Christ be offered to God at all?

Three ways only are conceivable:—

1. In the way in which He was actually offered on the Cross.

2. In mystery.

3. In mere human memorial.

1. In the way in which He was offered on the Cross, i.e., with all the preceding and attendant circumstances of shame, agony, and distress of body and mind, which are set forth in the Gospels.

Now, of course, the repetition of such an offering of such a Person would not only be impossible to the united power of the whole universe, but it is even unimaginable. It is inconceivable that any human being should think that he can so "offer" Christ. And yet, in the heat of controversy, men bandy words which seem at least to imply that their theological opponents presumed *so* to offer Christ.

If then it be worse than idle, if it be wilfully misleading, to impute to men in sane mind that they profess *so* to offer Christ, let us dismiss this, and turn to the second way possible.

2. And this is to offer Christ, or the Death of Christ, in a mystery.

Now it is necessary to believe and profess that Christ can be thus offered in a mystery, and this the mystery of the Eucharist, in order to shew that we do not believe for a moment that He can now be offered in the same manner as He was offered upon the Cross, and yet that the offering or presenting before God of such a Being and such a Sacrifice

of Atonement, and such a work of present Intercession, must be more than a mere memorial—a mere human memorial. It must partake, in some measure, of the infinite Mystery attaching to a Divine Person offering a sacrifice for moral evil in an inferior created nature, and to an Eternal Being offering a Sacrifice of Himself in time, and to the Presentation of that Sacrifice in an infinitely mysterious form on the very throne of God.

If the Son of God had offered a Sacrifice which need not, like all other sacrifices, be presented or pleaded, and need not be sacrificially partaken of, then there would be no mystery about the Eucharistic Sacrifice; even in Divine worship we should make a mere memorial with bare outward signs; but if He now presents His Sacrifice in Heaven, and has ordained a way of presenting it and partaking of it on earth, then such a thing must be "in mystery;" and if in mystery, then of course we do not know its limitations or dimensions, so to speak. Its connection in the Divine Mind and Will with the all-atoning Work may be very close; and believing this, we lay our hands to our lips and say that it is "in mystery."

If it be in mystery, there it must be left; as long, at least, as the present state of things lasts.

Again, if it is in mystery and so really inexplicable, one man may realise more of it than another. Of two men who subscribe to the same theological definitions, one may apprehend it far more perfectly than another. I have now before my mind two men, both brought up in the English Church, both of whom seceded from it to the Church of Rome, and who have both of them taken in that Church the same unique position which they took in the English, both in the front rank as preachers and as writers of sermons, both constantly adverting to the Eucharist in their sermons, and yet the one almost, I may say, ignoring its sacrificial aspect, and the other bringing it out with extraordinary power.

Again, I am prepared to shew that amongst Romanists *there is the* greatest possible difference in their apprehen*sion of the* Eucharistic Sacrifice and their consequent prac-

tical treating of it. Nothing, for instance, seems to me more marked than the way in which it was apprehended by Gardiner and Harding three hundred years ago, and by Moehler in our day. No variations amongst us can be greater.

In fact, if the reader will turn to page 315 of the volume of Ridley's works, he will find a statement by Gardiner far lower in every respect than that of Ridley. It runs, "In the Sacrifice of the Church Christ's Death is not iterated, but a memory daily renewed of that death, so that Christ's offering on the Cross, once done and consummate, is now only remembered."

I shall now give testimonies to a belief in the Eucharistic Sacrifice from a number of Divines of our own Church: and I shall purposely confine myself to the writings of men of very decided anti-Romanist views. And first,

BISHOP ANDREWS:

"This is it in the Eucharist, that answereth to the Sacrifice in the Passover: the memorial, to the figure. To them [the Jews] it was, 'Hoc facite in Mei præfigurationem' (Do this in præfiguration of Me): to us it is, 'Do this in commemoration of Me.' To them, 'prænuntiare;' to us, 'annuntiare;' there is the difference. By the same rules that theirs was, by the same may ours be termed a Sacrifice. In rigour of speech, neither of them; for (to speak after the exact manner of Divinity) there is but one only Sacrifice, *veri nominis*, properly so called, that is, Christ's Death: And that Sacrifice but once actually performed, at His Death: but ever before represented, in figure, from the beginning; and ever since repeated, in memory, to the world's end. That only absolute; all else relative to it, representative of it, operative by it. The Lamb, but once actually slain, in the fulness of time; but virtually, was from the beginning, is, and shall be, to the end of the world."—'Sermons of the Resurrection,' No. 7.

"The Eucharist ever was, and by us is considered, both as a sacrament and as a Sacrifice."—Answer to Cardinal Perron.

"For the altar in the Old Testament is, by Malachi, called 'Mensa Domini' (Mal. i. 7), and of the Table, in the New Testament, by the Apostle it is said, 'Habemus altare.'"—'Altars.'

BISHOP HALL:

"That in the Sacred Supper there is a Sacrifice (in that sense wherein the Fathers spoke) none of us ever doubted; but that is there, either Latrieutical (as Bellarmine distinguishes it not ill) or Eucharistical; that is here (as Chrysostom speaks) a remembrance

of a Sacrifice; that is, as Augustine interprets it, a memorial of Christ's Passion celebrated in the Church; and from this sweet commemoration of our Redemption there arises another Sacrifice, the Sacrifice of praise; and from thence a true Peace-offering of the Christian soul: these three sacrifices offer themselves to us here; but for any propitiatory Sacrifice, unless it be (as the gloss interprets it) representatively, I find none, none essential, none (as the Tridentines labour to persuade) true and proper; neither, indeed, can there be."—'No Peace with Rome,' § xix.

MEDE:

"Definition of Sacrifice: 'An oblation of thanksgiving and prayer to God the Father through Jesus Christ, and His Sacrifice commemorated in the creatures of bread and wine, wherewith God had been first agnized.' So that this Sacrifice, as you see, hath a double object or matter; first, praise and prayer, which you may call 'Sacrificum quod'; secondly, the commemoration of Christ's Sacrifice upon the Cross, which is 'Sacrificum quo,' the Sacrifice whereby the other is accepted. For all the prayers, thanksgivings, and devotions of a Christian are tendered up to God in the Name of Jesus Christ crucified. . . . Now that which we in all our prayers and thanksgivings do vocally, when we say, 'Through Jesus Christ our Lord,' the ancient Church, in her public and solemn service did visibly, by representing Him, according as He commanded, in the symbols of His Body and Blood; for there He is commemorated and received by us, for the same end for which He was given and suffered for us; that, through Him, we receiving forgiveness of our sins, God our Father might accept our service and hear our prayers we make unto Him. What time then so fit and seasonable to commend our devotions unto God, as when the Lamb of God is slain upon the Holy Table, and we receive visibly, though mystically, those gracious pledges of His blessed Body and Blood.

"Instead, therefore, of the slaying of beasts and burning of incense, whereby they called upon the name of God in the Old Testament, the Fathers, I say, believed our Saviour ordained this Sacrament of bread and wine as a rite whereby to give thanks and make supplication to His Father in His Name. The mystery of which rite they took to be this: that as Christ by presenting His Death and Satisfaction to His Father continually intercedes for us in heaven; so the Church on earth semblably approaches the Throne of Grace, by representing Christ to His Father in these Holy Mysteries of His Death and Passion.

"Well, then, Christ is offered in this Sacred Supper, not hypostatically, as the Papists would have Him (for so He was but once offered) but commemoratively only; that is, by this sacred rite of bread and wine we present and inculcate His blessed Passion to His Father. We put Him in mind thereof, by setting the monuments thereof before Him; we testify our own mindfulness thereof *unto His* Sacred Majesty; that so He would, for His sake, accord*ing to the* tenour of His covenant, in Him be favourable and pro*pitious unto us,* miserable sinners."

BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR:

"The celebration of the Holy Sacrament is the great mysteriousness of the Christian religion, and succeeds to the most solemn rite of natural and Judaical religion, the law of sacrificing. For God spared mankind, and took the Sacrifice of beasts, together with our solemn prayers, for an instrument of expiation. But these could not purify the soul from sin, but were typical of the Sacrifice of something that could. But nothing could do this, but either the offering of all that sinned, that every one should be the anathema or devoted thing; or else by some one of the same capacity, who, by some superadded excellency, might in his own personal sufferings have a value great enough to satisfy for all the whole kind of sinning persons. This the Son of God, Jesus Christ, God and Man, undertook, and finished by a Sacrifice of Himself upon the altar of the Cross.

"2. This Sacrifice, because it was perfect, could be but one, and that once; but because the needs of the world should last as long as the world itself, it was necessary that there should be a perpetual ministry established, whereby this one-sufficient Sacrifice should be made eternally effectual to the several new arising needs of all the world who should desire it, or in any sense be capable of it.

"3. To this end Christ was made a Priest for ever; He was initiated or consecrated on the Cross, and there began His Priesthood, which was to last till His coming to judgment. It began on earth, but was to last and be officiated in Heaven, where He sits perpetually representing and exhibiting to the Father that great effective Sacrifice which He offered on the Cross, to eternal and never-failing purposes.

"4. As Christ is pleased to represent to His Father that great Sacrifice as a means of atonement and expiation for all mankind, and with special purposes and intendment for all the elect, all that serve Him in holiness; so He hath appointed, that the same ministry shall be done upon earth too, in our manner, and according to our proportion; and therefore hath constituted and separated an order of men, who, by shewing forth the Lord's Death by sacramental representation, may pray unto God after the same manner that our Lord and High Priest does; that is, offer to God and represent, in this solemn prayer and Sacrament, Christ, as already offered; so sending up a gracious instrument, whereby our prayers may, for His sake and in the same manner of intercession, be offered up to God in our behalf, and for all them for whom we pray, to all those purposes for which Christ died."—'Holy Living,' ch. iv. sec. x.

DR. BREVINT:

The extract from this divine which I now give the reader, I give not merely because of its own intrinsic excellence, but because it has the *imprimatur* of both John and Charles Wesley. The Wesleys jointly published a book of hymns on the Lord's Supper, and to this they appended a

"Preface concerning the Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice," extracted from Dr. Brevint. It contains by no means the whole of Brevint's book, so that the matter extracted must represent the matured views of the Wesleys; my edition, the seventh, being published in 1776. The following words of Brevint are on the 21st page:—

"Nevertheless, this Sacrifice, which by a real oblation was not to be offered more than once, is, by a devout and thankful commemoration, to be offered up every day. This is what the Apostle calls to 'set forth the Death of the Lord;' to set it forth, as well before the eyes of God His Father, as before the eyes of all men; and what St. Austin explained when he said, 'The Holy Flesh of Jesus was offered in three manners—by *prefiguring sacrifices* under the law, before His coming into the world; in *real deed* upon His Cross; and by a *commemorative Sacrament* when He ascended into Heaven.' All comes to this: 1. That the Sacrifice in itself can never be repeated. 2. That nevertheless this Sacrament, by our remembrance, becomes a kind of Sacrifice whereby we present before God the Father that precious oblation of His Son once offered. And thus do we every day offer to God the meritorious sufferings of our Lord, as the only sure ground whereon God may give, and we obtain, the blessings we pray for. Now, there is no ordinance or mystery that is so blessed an instrument to reach this everlasting Sacrifice, and to set it forth solemnly before the eyes of God, as the Holy Communion is. To men it is a *sacred table* where God's minister is ordered to represent from God His Master the Passion of His dear Son, as still fresh, and still powerful for their eternal salvation. And to God it is an altar, whereon men mystically present to Him the same Sacrifice as still bleeding and suing for mercy."

BISHOP BEVERIDGE:

"Their Paschal Lamb represented our Saviour Christ, and the sacrificing of it the shedding of His Blood upon the Cross; and as the Passover was the memorial of the Israelites' redemption from Egypt's bondage (Exod. xii. 14), so is the Lord's Supper the memorial of our redemption from the slavery of sin, and assertion into Christian liberty; or, rather, it is a solemn and lively representation of the Death of Christ, and offering it again to God, as an atonement for sin, and reconciliation to His favour. So that I believe that this Sacrament, under the Gospel, succeeds to the rite of sacrificing under the Law, and is properly called the Christian Sacrifice, as representing the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross."—'Private Thoughts upon Religion.'

THE END.

LONDON: PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.

YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN,
October, 1875.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

GEORGE BELL & SONS.

BARRETT (A. C.) Companion to the Greek Testament. For the use of Theological Students and the Upper Forms in Schools. By A. C. Barrett, M.A., Caius College. *Third edition, enlarged and improved.* Fcap. 8vo. 5*s*.

This volume gives in a condensed form a large amount of information on the Text, Language, Geography, and Archæology; it discusses the alleged contradictions of the New Testament and the disputed quotations from the old, and contains introductions to the separate books.

BARRY (Dr.) Notes on the Catechism. For the Use of Schools. By the Rev. Alfred Barry, D.D., Principal of King's College, London. *Second edition, revised.* Fcap. 2*s*.

BLENCOWE (E.) Plain Sermons by the Rev. E. Blencowe. Vol. I. *Sixth edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 6*s*.

BLUNT (J. S.) Readings on the Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany. By J. S. Blunt. *Third edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 3*s*. 6*d*.

—— Life after Confirmation. 18mo. 1*s*.

BOYCE (E. J.) Examination Papers on Religious Instruction. By Rev. E. J. Boyce, M.A. Sewed. 1*s*. 6*d*.

—— Catechetical Hints and Helps. A Manual for Parents and Teachers on giving Instruction to Young Children in the Catechism of the Church of England. *Second edition.* Fcap. 2*s*.

BUTLER (Bp.) Sermons and Remains. With Memoir by the Rev. E. Steere, LL.D., Missionary Bishop in Central Africa. 6*s.*

*** This volume contains some additional remains, which are copyright, and render it the most complete edition extant.

—— Three Sermons on Human Nature, and Dissertation on Virtue. Edited by W. Whewell, D.D. With a Preface and a Syllabus of the Work. *Fourth and cheaper edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

CARTER (T. T.) The Devout Christian's Help to Meditation on the Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Containing Meditations and Prayers for every day in the year. Edited by the Rev. T. T. Carter, Rector of Clewer. 2 vols. Fcap. 8vo. 12*s.* Or in five parts, three at 2*s.* 6*d.*; and two at 2*s.* each.

COMPTON (B.) Private Devotions for Church Helpers. By the Rev. B. Compton, Rector of All Saints', Margaret Street. 16mo. Cloth. 1*s.* 6*d.*

DAVIES (T. L. O.) Bible-English. Chapters on Words and Phrases in the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures and the Book of Common Prayer, no longer in common use; illustrated from contemporaneous writers. By the Rev. T. Lewis O. Davies, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary-extra, Southampton. Small crown 8vo. [*In the press.*

DENTON (W.) A Commentary on the Gospels for the Sundays and other Holy Days of the Christian Year. By the Rev. W. Denton, A.M., Worcester College, Oxford, and Incumbent of St. Bartholomew's, Cripplegate. Vol. I. Advent to Easter. *Third edition.* 18*s.* Vol. II. Easter to the Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity. *Second edition.* 18*s.* Vol. III. Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity to Advent; and Holy Days. *Second edition.* 18*s.*

—— Commentary on the Epistles for the Sundays and other Holy Days of the Christian Year. By the Rev. W. Denton, Author of 'A Commentary on the Gospels,' &c. Vol. I. Advent to Trinity. 8vo. *Second edition.* 18*s.* Vol. II. *Completing* the work. 18*s.*

DENTON (W.) A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Vol. I. 18*s.* Vol. II. *preparing.*

These Commentaries originated in Notes collected by the compiler to aid in the composition of expository sermons. They are derived from all available sources, and especially from the wide but little-known field of theological comment found in the 'Schoolmen' of the Middle Ages. The special nature of the sources from which they have been derived ought to make them indispensable to all who wish to expound the Holy Scriptures with as much understanding as may be obtained by extraneous help.

—— The Grace of the Ministry. Considered as a Divine Gift of uninterrupted Transmission and Twofold Character. Edited by the Rev. William Denton, M.A. Oxon., Author of 'Commentary on the Gospels and Epistles,' &c. 8vo. 16*s.*

GOODWIN (Bp.) Confirmation Day. Being a Book of Instruction for Young Persons how they ought to spend that solemn day. By the Right Rev. Harvey Goodwin, D.D., Bishop of Carlisle. Eighth Thousand. 2*d.*, or 25 for 3*s.* 6*d.*

—— Plain Sermons on Ordination and the Ministry of the Church. Preached on divers occasions by Harvey Goodwin, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

'The suggestions offered in these pages are all in good taste, and inspired by a true regard for the interests of the Church.'—*English Churchman.*

'Very simple in their teaching, direct, unadorned, and not doctrinal.'—*Literary Churchman.*

—— Parish Sermons. By Harvey Goodwin, D.D. First Series. *Third edition.* 12mo. 6*s.* Second Series (*Out of print*). Third Series. Third edition. 12mo. 7*s.* Fourth Series, 12mo. 7*s.* With Preface on Sermons and Sermon Writing. 7*s.*

—— A Guide to the Parish Church. By Harvey Goodwin, D.D. 1*s.* sewed; 1*s.* 6*d.* cloth.

—— Lectures upon the Church Catechism. By Harvey Goodwin, D.D. 12mo. 4*s.*

—— Sermons Preached before the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. By Harvey Goodwin, D.D. [*In the press.*

—— Plain Thoughts concerning the Meaning of Holy Baptism. By Harvey Goodwin, D.D. *Second edition.* 2*d.*, or 25 for 3*s.* 6*d.*

GOODWIN (Bp.) The Worthy Communicant; or, 'Who may come to the Supper of the Lord?' By Harvey Goodwin, D.D. *Second edition.* 2*d.*, or 25 for 3*s.* 6*d.*

HARDWICK (C. H.) History of the Articles of Religion. To which is added a Series of Documents from A.D. 1536 to A.D. 1615. Together with illustrations from contemporary sources. By the late Charles Hardwick, B.D., Archdeacon of Ely. *Second edition, corrected and enlarged.* 8vo. 12*s.*

HAWKINS (Canon). Family Prayers:—Containing Psalms, Lessons, and Prayers, for every Morning and Evening in the Week. By the late Rev. Ernest Hawkins, B.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's. *Fourteenth edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.*

HOOK (W. F.) Short Meditations for Every Day in the Year. By the Very Rev. W. F. Hook, D.D., Dean of Chichester. *New edition, carefully revised.* 2 vols. Fcap. 8vo. Large type. 14*s.* Also 2 vols. (1260 pages). 32mo. Cloth, 5*s.*; calf, gilt edges, 9*s.*

—— The Christian Taught by the Church's Services. *A new edition, revised and altered to accord with the New Lectionary.* 1 vol. Fcap. 8vo. Large type. 6*s.* 6*d.* Also 1 vol. (490 pages). Royal 32mo. Cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*; calf, gilt edges, 4*s.* 6*d.*

—— Holy Thoughts and Prayers, arranged for Daily Use on each Day of the Week, according to the stated Hours of Prayer. *Fifth edition, with additions.* 16mo. Cloth, red edges, 2*s.*; calf, gilt edges, 3*s.*

—— Verses for Holy Seasons. By C. F. Alexander. Edited by the Very Rev. W. F. Hook, D.D. *Fifth edition.* Fcap. 3*s.* 6*d.*

HUMPHRY (W. G.) An Historical and Explanatory Treatise on the Book of Common Prayer. By W. G. Humphry, B.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Prebendary of St. Paul's and Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields. *Fifth edition, revised and enlarged.* Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

—— The New Table of Lessons Explained, with the Table of Lessons and a Tabular Comparison of the Old and New Proper Lessons for Sundays and Holy Days. By W. G. Humphry, B.D. Fcap. 1*s.* 6*d.*

LEWIN (T.) The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. By Thomas Lewin, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., Trinity College, Oxford, Barrister-at-Law, Author of 'Fasti Sacri,' 'Siege of Jerusalem,' 'Cæsar's Invasion,' 'Treatise on Trusts,' &c. With upwards of 350 Illustrations finely engraved on Wood; Maps, Plans, &c. In 2 vols. *Third edition, revised.* Demy 4to. 2*l.* 2*s.*

—— Fasti Sacri; or, a Key to the Chronology of the New Testament. 4to. 21*s.*

LIAS (J. J.) The Doctrinal System of St. John, considered as evidence for the date of his Gospel. By the Rev. J. J. Lias, M.A., Professor of Modern Literature and Lecturer on Hebrew at St. David's College, Lampeter, sometime Scholar of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Cr. 8vo. [*Nearly ready.*

LUMBY (J. R.) History of the Creeds. By J. Rawson Lumby, M.A., Tyrwhitt's Hebrew Scholar, Crosse Divinity Scholar, Classical Lecturer of Queens', and late Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

—— The Ancient Confessions of the Sixteenth Century, with special reference to the Articles of the Church of England. By J. Rawson Lumby. [*In the press.*

MILL (Dr.) Lectures on the Catechism. Delivered in the Parish Church of Brasted, in the Diocese of Canterbury. By W. H. Mill, D.D., formerly Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. Edited by the Rev. B. Webb, M.A. Fcap. 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

—— Observations on the attempted Application of Pantheistic Principles to the Theory and Historic Criticism of the Gospels. By W. H. Mill, D.D. *Second edition, with the Author's latest notes and additions.* Edited by his Son-in-law, the Rev. B. Webb, M.A. 8vo. 14*s.*

—— Five Sermons on the Temptation of Christ our Lord in the Wilderness. Preached before the University of Cambridge in Lent, 1844. By W. H. Mill, D.D. *New edition.* 8vo. 6*s.*

MONSELL (Dr.) Simon the Cyrenian, and other Poems. *Second Thousand.* 32mo. 5*s.*

—— Watches by the Cross. *Second edition.* Cloth, red edges, 1*s.*

—— Our New Vicar; or, Plain Words about Ritual and Parish Work. Fcap. 8vo. *Seventh edition.* 5*s.*

—— The Parish Hymnal; after the Order of the Book of Common Prayer. Cloth, 32mo. 1*s.* 4*d.*

MONSELL (Dr.) Hymns of Love and Praise for the Church's Year. By the late Rev. J. S. B. Monsell, LL.D., Vicar of St. Nicholas, Guildford. *Second edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

—— The Winton Church Catechist. Questions and Answers on the Teaching of the Church Catechism. 32mo. cloth, 3*s.* Also in Four Parts, 6*d.* or 9*d.* each.

PAPERS on Preaching and Public Speaking. By a Wykehamist. *Second thousand.* Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

PARISH PRIEST'S (The) Book of Offices and Instructions for the Sick. Compiled by a Priest of the Diocese of Sarum. Post 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

PEARSON (Bp.) on the Creed. Carefully printed from an Early Edition. With Analysis and Index. Edited by E. Walford, M.A. Post 8vo. 5*s.*

PEROWNE (Canon). The Book of Psalms; a New Translation, with Introductions and Notes, Critical and Explanatory. By the Rev. J. J. Stewart Perowne, B.D., Canon Residentiary of Llandaff, Fellow of Trinity College, and Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. 8vo. *Third edition.* Vol. I. 18*s.* Vol. II. 16*s.*

—— The Book of Psalms. An abridged Edition for Schools and Private Students. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— Immortality. Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge. Being the Hulsean Lectures for 1868. By J. J. S. Perowne, B.D., Canon of Llandaff, Vice-Principal and Professor of Hebrew in St. David's College, Lampeter. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

PINNOCK (W. H.) Christ our King. A Narrative of His Life and Ministry, and of the Foundation of His Kingdom. By the Rev. W. H. PINNOCK, LL.D., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Author of 'Clerical Papers,' &c. Demy 8vo. [*Immediately.*

SADLER (M. F.) The Church Teacher's Manual of Christian Instruction. Being the Church Catechism expanded and explained in Question and Answer, for the use of Clergymen, Parents and Teachers. By the Rev. M. F. Sadler, Author of 'Church Doctrine—Bible Truth,' 'The Sacrament of Responsibility,' &c. *Twelfth thousand.* Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

'It is impossible to overrate the service to religious instruction achieved by this compact and yet pregnant volume. . . . . We owe many boons to Mr. Sadler, whose sermons and theological lectures and treatises have wrought much good in matters of faith. This Catechetical Manual is second to none of such.'—*English Churchman.*

SADLER (M. F.) The One Offering. A Treatise on the Sacrificial Nature of the Eucharist. Fcap. *Second edition.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

—— The Second Adam and the New Birth; or, the Doctrine of Baptism as contained in Holy Scripture. *Fourth edition, greatly enlarged.* Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

'The most striking peculiarity of this useful little work is that its author argues almost exclusively from the Bible. We commend it most earnestly to clergy and laity, as containing in a small compass, and at a trifling cost, a body of sound and Scriptural doctrine respecting the New Birth, which cannot be too widely circulated.'—*Guardian.*

—— The Sacrament of Responsibility; or, Testimony of the Scripture to the Teaching of the Church on Holy Baptism, with especial reference to the Cases of Infants; and Answers to Objections. *Sixth edition.* 6*d.*

—— The Sacrament of Responsibility. With the addition of an Introduction, in which the religious speculations of the last twenty years are considered in their bearings on the Church doctrine of Holy Baptism, and an Appendix giving the testimony of writers of all ages and schools of thought in the Church. On fine paper, and neatly bound in cloth. 2*s.* 6*d.*

—— Church Doctrine—Bible Truth. *Tenth thousand.* Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

This work contains a full discussion of the so-called Damnatory Clauses of the Athanasian Creed. The new edition has additional Notes on Transubstantiation and Apostolical Succession.

'Some writers have the gift of speaking the right word at the right time, and the Rev. M. F. Sadler is pre-eminently one of them. 'Church Doctrine —Bible Truth,' is full of wholesome truths fit for these times. . . . . He has the power of putting his meaning in a forcible and intelligible way, which will, we trust, enable his valuable work to effect that which it is well calculated to effect, viz. to meet with an appropriate and crushing reply one of the most dangerous misbeliefs of the time.'—*Guardian.*

—— Parish Sermons. Trinity to Advent. *Second edition.* 6*s.*

—— Plain Speaking on Deep Truths. *Third edition.* 6*s.*

—— Abundant Life, and other Sermons. 6*s.*

—— Scripture Truths, A Series of Ten Tracts on Holy Baptism, The Holy Communion, Ordination, &c. Prices ½*d.* 1*d.*, or 1½*d.* according to size.

SADLER (M. F.) The Communicant's Manual; being a Book of Self-examination, Prayer, Praise, and Thanksgiving. By the Rev. M. F. Sadler. Royal 32mo. *Sixth thousand.* Roan, 2*s.*; cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.* Also in best morocco, 7*s.*

*** A Cheap Edition in limp cloth. *Sixteenth thousand.* 8*d.*

—— A Larger Edition on fine paper, red rubrics. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*; best morocco, 8*s.* 6*d.*

SCRIVENER (Dr.) Novum Testamentum Græcum, Textus Stephanici, 1550. Accedunt variæ lectiones editionum Bezæ, Elzeviri, Lachmanni, Tischendorfii, et Tregellesii. Curante F. H. Scrivener, M.A., LL.D. 16mo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

This Edition embodies all the readings of Tregelles, and of Tischendorf's Eighth or latest Editions.

An Edition with wide Margin for Notes. 7*s.* 6*d.*

—— Codex Bezæ Cantabrigiensis. Edited, with Prolegomena, Notes, and Facsimiles, by F. H. Scrivener, M.A., LL.D., Prebendary of Exeter. 4to. 26*s.*

—— A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus with the Received Text of the New Testament; to which is prefixed a Critical Introduction. By F. H. Scrivener, M.A. *Second edition, revised.* Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

—— A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament. With forty Facsimiles from Ancient Manuscripts. Containing also an Account of the Egyptian Versions by Canon Lightfoot, D.D. For the Use of Biblical Students. By F. H. Scrivener, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. *New edition.* Demy 8vo. 16*s.*

—— Six Lectures on the Text of the New Testament and the ancient Manuscripts which contain it. Chiefly addressed to those who do not read Greek. By the Rev. F. H. Scrivener. With facsimiles from MSS. &c. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

THOMAS À KEMPIS. On the Imitation of Christ. A New Translation. By H. Goodwin, D.D. *Third edition.* With fine Steel Engraving after Guido, 5*s.*; without the Engraving, 3*s.* 6*d.* Cheap edition, 1*s.* cloth; 6*d.* sewed.

YOUNG (Rev. P.) Daily Readings for a Year, on the Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By the Rev. Peter Young, M.A. *Third edition, revised.* 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*